This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

ARTES
SCIENTIA
VERITAS
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SI QUAERIS PENINSULAM AMOENAM
CIRCUMSPICE

7
M938

THE

WORKS

OF

Walter Moyle Eſq;

None of which were ever before Publiſh'd.

VOL. II.

LONDON,

Printed for J. DARBY, A. BETTESWORTH, F. FAYRAM, J. OSBORN and T. LONGMAN, J. PEMBERTON, J. HOOKE, C. RIVINGTON, F. CLAY, J. BATLEY, and E. SYMON. M.DCC.XXVI.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
DUPLICATE

REMARKS

Upon ſome Paſſages in

Dr. *Prideaux*'s Connection

OF THE

Old and *New Teſtament*:

In ſeveral LETTERS between

Mr. *Moyle* and Dr. *Prideaux*.

REMARKS

UPON

Dr. *Prideaux*'s Connection.

Part I. Book I. Page 9. 8*vo*.

LETTER I.

SIR,

YOU ſay that " all the Traffick " which the *Weſtern* Parts of " the World, from that time " (when the PTOLOMEYS pre- " vail'd in *Egypt*) had with *Perſia*, *In-* " *dia*, *Arabia*, and the *Eaſtern* Coaſts of

271791

" *Africa*, was wholly carry'd on thro' " the *Red-Sea*, and the Mouth of the " *Nile*." But your own Author STRABO only ſays, ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολύ, that the greateſt Part of the Trade of *India* was driven by the way of *Alexandria*. But * APPIAN expreſly contradicts you; for he makes *Palmyra* a celebrated Mart for the *Indian* and *Arabian* Commodities, which the Merchants of that City brought from *Perſia*, and afterwards ſold to the *Romans*. *Palmyra*, by the Advantage of its Situation near the *Euphrates*, lay very conveniently for ingroſſing the greateſt Part of the Trade of *India*, which was carry'd on over Land by the way of *Perſia*; and we are aſſur'd by † A. MARCELLINUS, that *Batue*, a Town of *Authemiſia* in the North of *Meſopotamia*, near the *Euphrates*, was a noted Mart for the ſame Traffick, there being held every Year a Fair, to which there was a vaſt Reſort to buy up Commodities brought from the *Indians* and the *Seres*. As for

* De Bell. Civil. v. p. 676. Ed. Steph.

† Lib. xiv. c. 3.

the

the Trade with the *Seres*, we know from the ſame * Author 'twas carry'd on by the Merchants over-land, who travell'd from *Perſia* to that Country, thro the Territories of the *Sacæ*; and whatever *Indian* Commodities came by Sea to either of theſe Places, 'tis plain they muſt be brought by the way of the *Perſian* Gulph, and ſo up the *Euphrates*; and not from the *Red-Sea*, which lay too far off. 'Tis true, a great Trade with *India* was driven by the way of the *Red-Sea* and *Alexandria*, as appears not only from STRABO, but from † PLINY, who has ſet down the Rout the Merchants took over-land from *Alexandria* to *Berenice*, and from thence by Sea to the Coaſt of *Malabar*. He adds, that the prime Coſt of *Indian* Goods, imported every Year into the *Roman* Empire, amounted to above 400,000 Pounds: And the ſame Author ‡ affirms, that the Empire loſt every Year by their Trade with *India*, *Arabia*,

* Lib. xxiii. c. 6. p. 292. Ed. Gronov.
† Lib. vi. c. 23. p. 703. Ed. Harduin.
‡ L. xii. 18.

and the *Jews*, above 800,000 Pounds. From which Paſſage, compar'd with the former, it appears that the *Romans* drove as great a Trade with the *Seres* and *Arabia*, as with *India*, *Tanto nobis deliciæ & fæminæ conſtant.* * TACITUS makes the ſame Complaint. Now, if 800,000 Pounds *per Ann.* were too great a Drain for the *Roman* Empire to bear—

I am, *&c.*

Part I. Book IV. Page 211.

Of ZOROASTRES.

LETTER II.

SIR,

THE Account of ZOROASTRES is ſo entertaining, and ſo extremely well told, that I have all the Inclination in the World to believe it true: But there

---

* Ann. iii. 53.

are

are ſome Circumſtances in it ſo inconſiſtent with the Relations of all the *Greek* and *Latin* Writers, that they give one very juſt ground to queſtion the Credit of the whole Story. 'Tis certain that the general Current of the old Writers places ZOROASTRES much earlier than the Reign of DARIUS HYSTASPES, as you may find in all the modern Collectors who have treated of that Subject. I will not enter into the Controverſy, whether there was only one of that Name, as you ſuppoſe, or more; nor will I pretend to determine the Age of ZOROASTRES, the Founder of the *Perſian* Religion, becauſe I think it impoſſible, among ſuch Variety of Opinions and Contradictions, to make any probable gueſs of the Truth. 'Tis ſufficient for my purpoſe, if I can prove him more antient than the Period you have plac'd him at. For this I need not produce you a long Liſt of the antient Hiſtorians; for they are all collected to my hand by MARSHAM, STANLEY, A. FABRICIUS, HUETIUS, *&c.* One Author indeed you wou'd rob me of, JUSTIN, by correcting him from DIODORUS SI-

CULUS: But the reverſe of this is true, and DIODORUS ought to be corrected by JUSTIN, as appears from a Paſſage of * ARNOBIUS, as 'tis read, and diſtinguiſh'd by either STANLEY, MARSHAM, or HERALDUS: that CTESIAS calls this *Bactrian* King, not OXYARTES, but ZOROASTRES; and conſequently the genuine Reading in DIODORUS, who profeſſes to follow him in his whole Relation of that War, was ZOROASTRES.

THE only antient Writer that ſeems to favour your Opinion, is AGATHIAS, who liv'd 1100 Years after, who makes ZOROASTRES contemporary with DARIUS HYSTASPES, as the *Perſians*, in his Age, gave out, in general, but at the ſame time, that 'twas impoſſible to know whether he was the Father of DARIUS or not; and if the Fact was then doubtful, I wou'd fain know how after Ages came by a better Information: And 'tis remarkable, that none of the Eaſtern Authors you have

* Lib. i. p. 31. compar'd with p. 5. Edit. Lugdun.

cited

cited are above 600 Years ſtanding; nor does the MIRCONDE, call'd TEXEIRA, the moſt celebrated of all the Eaſtern Hiſtorians, make mention of it in his Annals. * A. MARCELLINUS does indeed ſay he was the Father of DARIUS, but 'tis plain to every one who attentively conſiders the whole Period, that he places HYSTASPES long after the Age of ZOROASTRES, and † LACTANTIUS ſets him higher than the *Trojan* War. So that no manner of ſtreſs can be laid on this Argument,

‡ *APULEIUS* is another Author you produce to prove ZOROASTRES Contemporary with PYTHAGORAS. But you have intirely deſtroy'd the Credit of his Relation, by one Chronological Argument: To which I may add, that APULEIUS, in the very next Period, contradicts this Account himſelf; for he ſays, 'twas the prevailing Opinion that PYTHAGORAS came voluntarily into *Egypt*, and

* Lib. xxiii. c. 6. † Inſtit. vii. 15.
‡ Florid. 501. Edit. Lugdun.

there

there inſtructed himſelf in all the Learning of the *Egyptian* Prieſts, without mentioning a word of his converſing with ZOROASTRES, whom 'tis plain from his * Apology he thought many Ages elder than PYTHAGORAS, becauſe he makes him more antient than MOSES: which Paſſage, by the way, he copy'd from † PLINY, as HARDUIN very rightly obſerves. And indeed, on a Suppoſition that he was Contemporary with NINUS, and that the *Aſſyrian* Monarchy laſted 1400 Years, according to ‡ DIODORUS, or 1300 according to ** TROGUS, his Age muſt be carry'd ſome Centuries higher than MOSES. Nor can this Account, as you ſuppoſe, agree with NEBUCHADNEZZAR's Conqueſt of *Egypt*; for from that time to the Death of your ZOROASTRES (as appears by your own Reckoning) there had paſs'd 85 Years: and, allowing ZOROASTRES to have been 90 Years old at the time of his Death, which, by the way, was not a natural but a violent one,

---

* P. 319. † Lib. xxx. c. 1.
‡ Lib. ii. p. 115. Ed. Hanov. ** i. 2.

he

he cou'd have been but five Years old; and allowing JAMBLICHUS's Account of PYTHAGORAS's twelve Years Reſidence at *Babylon*, he cou'd have been but ſeventeen when PYTHAGORAS left that Place; and at that Age he was certainly too young to ſet up for a Doctor. But ſuppoſing PYTHAGORAS, for once, to have been at *Babylon* in NEBUCHADNEZZAR's time, or even later if you pleaſe, twenty Years before CAMBYSES's Conqueſt of *Egypt*; which is the loweſt Period, as you own, that can be allow'd for his Travels, and which was before *Babylon* was taken by CYRUS; I deny that he cou'd have ſeen any of the *Perſians* and *Magians* at *Babylon*; for that Sect ſpread only with the Arms and Empire of the *Perſians*, and into * *India*. And 'tis a Jeſt to ſuppoſe that any of the *Perſian* Prieſts wou'd ſettle, or be allow'd to ſettle, at *Babylon*, the head Quarters of *Sabianiſm*; for which, as you ſay, † *they had the utmoſt Deteſtation, and hated the* Babylonians

* Connect. Part I. Book III. p. 179.

† Book IV. p. 241.

above

above all others of that Sect. And if PYTHAGORAS cou'd have been inſtructed in the Learning of the MAGI there, he need not have been at the Pains to travel into *Perſia* upon that Errand, as * CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, and † PLINY aſſure us he did.

THE ZABRATUS of ‡ PORPHYRY, the ZARATUS of ** CLEMENS, of †† PLUTARCH, and JAMBLICHUS, and the ZARAN of ‡‡ CYRIL, I agree to be all one, but deny that either of them is ZOROASTRES. To begin with PORPHYRY, if by ZABRATUS he meant ZOROASTRES, why had he not call'd him ZOROASTRES, as he has done in his Book, *** *De Antro Nympharum*? And that very Paſſage has a Character of Time in it which will fix the Age of ZOROASTRES many Ages before DARIUS HYSTASPES: For he ſays, ZOROASTRES conſecrated a Grotto to the Worſhip of

---

* Strom. i. p. 357. Ed. Potter. † xxx. 1.
‡ In Pythagora, p. 185. Ed. Cantab. ** Ibid.
†† De Gen. animæ in Timæo, p. 1862. Ed. Steph.
‡‡ Contra Julian. p. 133. Ed. Spanhem. *** P. 254.

his

his God MITHRA, and gave the firſt riſe of that Cuſtom to other Nations. Now there are Examples enough of Grots and Caves conſecrated to Nymphs, and other Gods, to be met with in Hiſtory as high as the *Trojan* War, as appears from the Verſes of HOMER, which are the Subject of that Diſcourſe. To ſay nothing of JUPITER's Grotto, frequented by *MINOS, with many others mention'd by STRABO, PAUSANIAS, *&c.* long before the Reign of that Prince. In the next place, PORPHYRY plainly makes ZABRATUS a *Chaldæan*, as HOLSTENIUS has rightly remark'd; that is, a Philoſopher of that Sect, as the following Words plainly ſhow: And conſequently he cou'd not mean ZOROASTRES, who was a *Magian*. Some Writers have indeed confounded theſe two Sects, as CELSUS; but he is very juſtly laugh'd at for his Pains by †ORIGEN. CLEMENS and CYRIL make him an *Aſſyrian*, that is by Birth, tho a *Chal-*

* Strab. x. p. 482. Ed. Caſaub. Dion. Hal. l. ii. p. 91. Ed. Steph.

† Contra Celſum, i. p. 45. Ed. Cantab.

dæan

dæan by Profeſſion. *PLINY mentions ZARATUS, one of the Succeſſors of ZOROASTRES: but he muſt be different from the ZARATUS of CLEMENT, &c. becauſe he makes him a *Mede*, and a *Magian*. But this Paſſage however, plainly proves that ZARATUS and ZOROASTRES are Names of different Perſons, and not different Names for the ſame Perſon. I am ſenſible I have dwelt too long on an Argument which you your ſelf lay little ſtreſs on, and ſeem to give up: But before I part with this Subject, give me leave to obſerve one great Inconſiſtency which you have been guilty of in this Relation. You ſay, †*that* PYTHAGORAS *took the hint of retiring to a Grotto, &c. from his Maſter* ZOROASTRES: But ſince, by your Reckoning, ZOROASTRES had not ſet up for a Prophet, nor retir'd to his Cave till the Reign of DARIUS HYSTASPES, and PYTHAGORAS was return'd from his Travels above twenty Years before CAMBYSES's Conqueſt of *Egypt*, how was it poſſible for PYTHAGORAS to

* xxx. 1. † Part I. Book IV. p. 220.

follow

follow his Example in an Affair which happen'd ſo many Years after his own Retirement into the Cave; and which, had it been earlier, 'twas impoſſible, at that diſtance, he ſhou'd ever have heard of? His Notion of the Immortality of the Soul, he might as well learn from his Maſter PHERECYDES, who firſt advanc'd that Doctrine, according to CICERO and others*. But as for his *Metempſychoſis*, I own he might borrow it from the *Brachmans*, or even the *Magians*, who all believ'd that Doctrine, if your own Author, † PORPHYRY, is to be credited.

THE current of all Antiquity being againſt you, as to the Age of ZOROASTRES, the Credit of this whole Relation muſt reſt on the Authority of the *Eaſtern* Writers. There is no need to repeat what I have ſaid on this head, in the Article of AGATHIAS; for ſure no Man of Judgment will ſet the Credit of ſuch late

* Vid. Menag. ad Laertium, i. § 116.

† De abſtinentia, iv. 165.

and

and lying Writers in competition with Authors of ſuch eſtabliſh'd Reputation as the *Greek* and *Latin* Hiſtorians. For a Specimen of the Sincerity and Accuracy of the *Eaſtern* Writers, I appeal to the fam'd Hiſtorian of *Perſia*, MIRCONDE, whoſe Account of the Reign of DARIUS contains as many Lyes as Lines. There is not one Truth told in all the Relation; but the whole, from the beginning to the end, is a ſenſeleſs Rhapſody of ill-invented Fables and ridiculous Abſurdities. In a word, he is the moſt ſcandalous Writer I ever dipt into; for I never had the Patience to go thro' with him. His Character has given me a taſte of the reſt, and how little their Authority is to be depended on for the Truth of any antient Fact. * HUETIUS ſays, the modern *Perſians* make ZOROASTRES contemporary with ABRAHAM.

* P. 89.

Few

IN the next place, I ſhall examine ſome other Circumſtances of this Relation, which were either unknown, or contradicted by the old *Greek* and *Roman* Writers: And I ſhall begin with the great Alteration made by ZOROASTRES in the National Religion of *Perſia* under DARIUS HYSTASPES. Of this the Antients were all ſilent to a Man which is a good Proof of its Falſhood. Is it poſſible to imagine, that ſo memorable an Event cou'd have been paſt over in ſilence by ſo many diligent Hiſtorians, had they known it? or is it likely that a Fact, which muſt make ſo much Noiſe in the World, cou'd eſcape their Inquiry? Will any one believe that HERODOTUS, who paſs'd over ſo many *Perſian* Provinces to collect Materials for his Hiſtory, cou'd have miſs'd it in all his Travels? Or that CTESIAS, who reſided ſo many Years in the *Perſian* Court, cou'd be ignorant of a Fact which every Porter in *Perſia* muſt know? 'Tis ſtrange that XENOPHON, who convers'd with the younger CYRUS, and march'd with an Army into the heart of the *Perſian* Em-

pire, cou'd give his Countrymen no better Information at his return. But what is ſtrangeſt of all, how came it about that OSTANES, who attended XERXES in his Expedition againſt *Greece* but twelve Years after, and ſet the *Greeks* a madding after Magick, ſhou'd acquaint none of his Followers with the Original of his Sect, or the Age of its Founder? Theſe are all ſtrong Preſumptions againſt this Story: To which I ſhall add the Authority of XENOPHON*, who affirms that the Regulations made by CYRUS in the Religious Worſhip, continu'd without any Alteration down to his time: and in the cloſe of that Work, tho he has given a large Account of the corruption of their Morals, and military Diſcipline, of the neglect of their Education, with their total Degeneracy from the Virtue of their Anceſtors; yet he does not add one word of any Change in their National Worſhip, or the Principles of their Theology, which his Subject gave him a fair occaſion of doing, had there been any ſuch thing.

* Cyropædia, viii. p. 121. Ed. Stephani.

THE

THE principal Changes made by ZOROASTRES, in the Inſtitution of his new Religion, were, the building of Temples, which the *Perſians* wanted before, and the introducing a God ſuperior to the two Principles believ'd before. As to the firſt, I ſhan't argue againſt it, as I did in the former Article, from the ſilence of the old Writers, but from expreſs Authorities againſt you; and begin with *HERODOTUS, a *Perſian* Governor and Soldier, who directly affirms, that the *Perſians* of his Age (for he ſpeaks in the preſent Tenſe) had no Temples. †DINON, who flouriſh'd after the time of ALEXANDER, ſays, the *Perſians* ſacrific'd in the open Air, which ſhews they had no Temples; and ‡CICERO ſays, that XERXES, by the Inſtigation of the *Magians*, ſet fire to the Temples in *Greece*, upon this Principle, that the Univerſe was the Temple of the Gods, who ought to be at large and unconfin'd, and not coop'd up in Walls. CICERO has given the true Reaſon for

* L. i. p. 35. † Apud Clem. Alex. in Protrep. p. 56.
‡ De Leg. ii. 10.

the Averſion the *Perſians* bore to Temples, which did not proceed, as you ſuppoſe *, from an Abhorrence of worſhipping the Gods by Images; for they were as arrant *Polytheiſts* and Idolaters as any of their † Neighbours. 'Tis true, they abſtain'd from the uſe of Images, from that Perſuaſion. And HERODOTUS's Reaſon, rightly underſtood, is the ſame with CICERO's. Theſe Authorities do fully prove what I contend for, that the *Perſians* had no Temples long after the Reign of DARIUS: And the earlieſt Account we have of any Temples among them, is under TIBERIUS, many Ages after. And the Conjecture of LE CLERC and STANLEY, is very probable, that 'twas an Innovation in their Worſhip, by their Commerce with their Maſters the *Macedonians.*

THE moſt valuable part of ZOROASTRES's Syſtem, *viz.* his ſetting up a third Principle, ſuperior to the two old ones, is contradicted by all the old Writers. STANLEY's Citation from the Wri-

* P. 240. † Clem. Alex. p. 56, 7.

tings

tings of ZOROASTRES, which you and every body elſe allow to be ſpurious, can be of no Weight; and PLUTARCH's Account of his believing two independent Gods, with a middle one between them, does not agree with your Hypotheſis. ARISTOTLE, HERMIPPUS, EUDOXUS, * THEOPOMPUS, make him hold two Principles only, the Good and the Bad one: And AGATHIAS long after, affirms the ſame of the *Perſians* in his Age, and adds, as you likewiſe † aſſert, that the *Manichees* borrow'd the great Article of their Hereſy from this Doctrine. And from theſe all put together, it ſeems very plain that this Refinement of the *Perſian* Theology was of a much later Date than you ſuppoſe. I am, *&c.*

---

* Apud Laertium in Proæm. † P. 179.

Part I. Book V. p. 305, 6.

LETTER III.

SIR,

WHATEVER becomes of ISAAC VOSSIUS's Correction of JOSEPHUS, *lib.* xi. *c.* 7. I can't help thinking that the Paſſage is corrupted; for στρατηγὸς τοῦ λαοῦ Ἀρταξέρξου is not *Greek*, but a mere *Hebraiſm*. 'Tis true, we often meet with λαὸς for στρατὸς in the Septuagint, which is a literal Tranſlation; but 'tis not likely that ſo elegant a Writer as JOSEPHUS would uſe ſuch a barbarous Phraſe. I believe it ſhou'd be read ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ Ωχου Ἀρταξέρξου. I took the hint of this Correction from SCALIGER's συναγωγὴ ἱστοριῶν, (*p.* 379.) which, as he owns (*p.* 431.) was a Collection of his own making, partly out of printed Books, and partly out of Manuſcripts. He there reads it ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ Ἀχου, &c. I make no doubt but he found Ἀχου in ſome Manuſcript of JOSEPHUS; for otherwiſe he never wou'd have ſet down a Word which has no meaning

ing in it: The change of one Letter makes it ὁχυ, which I believe is the true Reading. BAGOSES is BAGOAS, who was the prime Favourite, and chief General to OCHUS, under whoſe Reign all this Affair was tranſacted. Biſhop *USHER has an Argument which has ſtarted an Objection againſt my Hypotheſis; but his Argument is all founded on a miſtaken Suppoſition, that JOHANAN, the Son of ELIASHIB, mention'd by †EZRA, in the ſeventh Year of ARTAXEREXES LONGIMANUS, was the ſame JOHANAN who was afterwards High-Prieſt. But 'tis plain from ‡JOSEPHUS, the *Alexandrian* Chronicle, and **NEHEMIAH, that JOHANAN, or JONATHAN the High-Prieſt, was not the Son of ELIASHIB, but of JOIADA, as you have rightly obſerv'd; which intirely deſtroys the Biſhop's Conjecture. You have been a little too ſevere in your Cenſure of JOSEPHUS, as if he had been ignorant of the Succeſſion of the *Perſian* Kings: For it ought to be conſider'd, that his principal Buſineſs was

* Ad Ann. P. Jul. 4312. † C. x. 6.
‡ Lib. xi. c. 7. ** C. xii. 11.

to write the Hiſtory of his own Nation, nor was he oblig'd by the Rules of Hiſtory to mention the Affairs of *Perſia* any farther than they were intermix'd with the Affairs of the *Jews*: And if he has given an Account of the firſt ſix Kings of *Perſia*, 'twas becauſe they had all diſtinguiſh'd themſelves by Acts of Favour or Severity to the *Jews*, and on that account had a Right to be mention'd: And if he has paſs'd over any of their Succeſſors in ſilence, 'twas becauſe nothing of note that related to *Judæa* was tranſacted in their times till the Reign of OCHUS, whom I think he has mention'd, as well as DARIUS CODOMANNUS; becauſe in his Reign the *Jews* chang'd their Maſters, and became ſubject to the *Macedonians*; which was an Event that nearly concern'd his own Nation, and ought not to be omitted. This is a very probable Account why JOSEPHUS has omitted, in his Hiſtory, ſome of the *Perſian* Kings; but 'tis not poſſible to conceive that an Author ſo converſant in the *Greek* Writers cou'd be ignorant of the Series of the *Perſian* Kings. EPHORUS, whom he has ſo often cited, and who concludes his Hiſtory about the

end

end of OCHUS, might have amply inſtructed him in the *Perſian* Hiſtory.

ANOTHER Proof in favour of this Opinion may be drawn from the Argument of this Chapter, which calls this ARTAXERXES, ARTAXERXES the younger, that is OCHUS. This plainly ſhews that my Correction was the original Reading of the Manuſcripts; for except this ſingle Paſſage, there is nothing elſe in the whole Chapter which can give the Reader any light what ARTAXERXES is meant. As for the Arguments of the Chapters, if they were not compos'd by JOSEPHUS himſelf, yet 'tis certain that they are of an antient Date, becauſe they are found in moſt of the Manuſcripts; as appears from the various Readings in Dr. BERNARD's unfiniſh'd Edition of JOSEPHUS.

I am, Sir, *&c.*

Part I. Book VII. Page 486.

LETTER IV.

SIR,

I SHALL next conſider that celebrated Story in JOSEPHUS, of ALEXANDER's coming to *Jeruſalem*, &c. as 'tis ſet down in all its Circumſtances by * JOSEPHUS. I am not ignorant that ſome later Writers vary in ſome Particlars, and that EUSEBIUS has very dextrouſly given it a more plauſible Air: But ſince JOSEPHUS is the original Author from whom they all borrow'd their Accounts, I ſhall examine it upon the foot he has deliver'd it down to us.

A. FABRICIUS, in his *Greek* † *Bibliotheque*, ſeems to ſuſpect the Credit of this Relation, and to give it up to the Arguments of VANDALE, (in his Reflections on the Hiſtory of the Seventy) to prove it inconſiſtent with the Accounts

* Antiq. Jud. xi. 8. † Vol. ii. p. 206.

of

of all the old Hiſtorians. I never read this Book of VANDALE, nor ever heard of one of his Arguments; but I ſhall give you my Reaſons why I am of his Opinion.

IN the firſt place, I ſhall urge the ſilence of all the old Hiſtorians who are now extant: And as for thoſe who are loſt, 'tis plain they never made any mention of it, becauſe JOSEPHUS has not produc'd their Teſtimonies, which he never fails to do upon all other Occaſions.

JOSEPHUS ſays that ALEXANDER march'd to *Jeruſalem* after the taking of *Gaza*; but you have very plainly prov'd that he march'd from *Gaza* directly into *Egypt:* and what is much ſtranger, * ARRIAN expreſly affirms, that all *Paleſtine*, except *Gaza*, had ſubmitted to him before he began the Siege of that City; and conſequently he had no need to march with his Army into *Judea*, in order to reduce it to his Obedience. This ſingle Argument is enough to ſhake the

* Lib. ii. p. 150. Connect. Part I. Book VII. p. 486.

Credit

Credit of this whole Relation. EUSEBIUS, who was aware of this Abſurdity, makes him march from *Tyre* to *Jeruſalem*: But ſince his Author, JOSEPHUS, was ignorant of this Circumſtance, I wiſh he had produc'd his Voucher, and told us how he came by a better light ſo many Ages after. The Paſſage of EUSEBIUS, as it now ſtands in SCALIGER's Edition, is corrupt and unintelligible, without the help of a Correction. I ſuppoſe it ſhou'd be thus read, *Alexander capta Tyro Judæam invadit, atque favorabiliter exceptus*, &c. But this Salvo of EUSEBIUS mends the matter very little; for not only JOSEPHUS, but all the old Hiſtorians, bring ALEXANDER directly from *Tyre* to *Gaza*, without making any halt by the way. As for Biſhop USHER's Quotation out of * PLINY, *Alexandro magno res ibi gerente*, that is, ALEXANDER making war in thoſe Parts, (for *ibi* in that place, needs not be reſtrain'd to *Jericho* only) I don't doubt but it either relates to the Siege of *Tyre*, or *Gaza*, which was a City of *Paleſtine*. It can never be meant

* Nat. Hiſt. xii. 25.

of

of *Jericho*; for we know not only from ARRIAN, but JOSEPHUS himſelf, that the *Jews* ſubmitted without ſtriking a Stroke. And I need not tell you that *res gerere* ſignifies *to wage War*. PLINY has us'd the like Phraſe in the ſame * Book, and † elſewhere; and not once in any other Senſe ‡. I do not know whether it be worth while to obſerve, that the barbarous Author of the *Excerpta Chronologica*, publiſh'd by SCALIGER after EUSEBIUS's Chronicle **, places this Journey of ALEXANDER to *Jeruſalem*, after his return from *Egypt*: and †† S. SEVERUS ſeems to intimate, that 'twas after all his Conqueſts were finiſh'd: which ſhews how uncertain they were of this matter.

LESS to the purpoſe is his Citation out of ‡‡ CURTIUS; for that Paſſage does not relate to *Jeruſalem*, as I have already ſufficiently prov'd, but to all the reſt of the Cities to which he had march'd in Perſon with his Army, from the Battle of *Iſſus* to the Siege of *Gaza*.

---

* C. 14. † Lib. xxxiii. c. 10.

‡ Vid. Bentleium ad Horat. Ode 6. lib. iii. Grævium ad Juſtin. xiii. 4. ** P. 72. †† ii. 16. ‡‡ iv. 5.

JOSEPHUS ſays that ALEXANDER was accompany'd in his March to *Jeruſalem* by *Phœnicians* and *Chaldæans*. 'Tis plain from the *Chaldæans* being join'd with the *Phœnicians*, that by them are meant not judiciary Aſtrologers (as the Word often ſignifies) but *Chaldæans* properly ſo call'd, that is, Natives and Inhabitants of *Chaldæa*. 'Tis natural enough to ſuppoſe that ALEXANDER might be attended by *Phœnicians*, who were a conquer'd Nation at that time; but how, in the name of wonder, came the *Chaldæans* in his Train? At that time he had neither conquer'd nor ſeen *Chaldæa*; nor was he Maſter of an Inch of it before the Battle of *Arbela*, when *Babylon* and all *Chaldæa* revolted to him; ſo that Circumſtance is moſt certainly falſe.

HE adds, that ALEXANDER, at the Approach of the High-Prieſt, worſhipp'd the Name of God, inſcrib'd on his Breaſt-Plate; and that PARMENIO being ſurpriz'd at it, ask'd him how he came to worſhip the High-Prieſt, when all the World worſhipp'd him? What kind of Worſhip

Worſhip was paid to ALEXANDER, we all know from * CURTIUS and † ARRIAN, who there uſes the ſame ‡ Word with JOSEPHUS; and ſo does ** PLUTARCH, †† CORNELIUS NEPOS, ‡‡ XENOPHON, and *** ÆLIAN, ſpeaking of the *Perſian* Kings. This Compliment was firſt made to ††† CYRUS King of *Perſia*, thoſe Kings being all conſider'd as ‡‡‡ Gods, and treated with **** Divine Honours. And from this Precedent the Flatterers of ALEXANDER copy'd, when they introduc'd this Practice. 'Tis impoſſible to underſtand this Speech of PARMENIO in any other Senſe: and then I am ſure this Part of the Story is notoriouſly falſe; for 'tis †††† certain that he did not ſet up for a God, or expect Divine Honours till long after the Death of DARIUS, and the complete Conqueſt of *Perſia*, which was ſome Years after this Tranſaction. From the Falſhood of this

---

* viii. 5. † iv. 264. ‡ προσκύνησις.
** In Alexand. p. 1276. †† In Conone. ‡‡ viii. 127.
*** Var. Hiſt. i. 21. ††† Xenophon, ibid.
‡‡‡ Vid. Æſchyli Perſas, v. 623. & Scholiaſten.
**** Arrian, Curtius, ibid.
†††† Arrian, Curtius, ibid. Trogus xii. 7. Ælian. ii. 19.

Article

Article you may judge of the Truth of the whole.

MY next Charge againſt JOSEPHUS is the Requeſt, he ſays, the High-Prieſt made to ALEXANDER, that he wou'd allow the *Jews* who dwelt in *Babylon* and *Media*, the free Exerciſe of their Religion; which implies, that ALEXANDER was then poſſeſs'd of that part of *Aſia*, which is manifeſtly falſe: for he was maſter of neither of them till after he had fought the Battel of *Arbela*, which was, I think, the Year after this Tranſaction. I know very well, that USHER has given another turn to this Paſſage; but my Interpretation of the Words is, I think, more plain and natural: and whoever conſiders the Miſtake of the Author of this Story, in mentioning the *Chaldæans* where there is no room for the Expreſſion, will be apt to think he was capable of committing the like Blunder in Chronology a ſecond time.

I SHALL conclude with an Argument from the *Alexandrian* Chronicle, which places the Death of JADDUS the High-Prieſt

Prieſt ſome Years before DARIUS CODOMANNUS came to the Crown, and conſequently this whole Story is falſe from top to bottom. I don't know what force this Argument will have with other Criticks, but I think it ought to weigh a good deal with you, becauſe you have follow'd his Account of the * Succeſſion and Chronologies of the High-Prieſts, and without it your Hypotheſis of the ſeventy Weeks can never be maintain'd: So that you ought in Juſtice to retain his Authority here, or to reject it there.

THERE are ſome other Circumſtances in this Story, which lie very open, and want to be conſider'd. The two Dreams are pretty extraordinary, nor is it very likely that an inſolent young Conqueror, who had the Vanity before the Year was over to get himſelf pronounc'd the Son of JUPITER HAMMON, ſhou'd throw himſelf at the feet of the High-Prieſt, (for that's the meaning of the Word προσκυνέω, as appears from the Authors I have cited

* Connect. Part I. Book VI. p. 411.

on that head) and worſhip the Name of a God that was either unknown or deſpis'd by the *Greeks*, and all the Heathen Nations. Nor does JADDUS ſeem to have acted a very conſiſtent Part in declaring at firſt, before the taking of *Tyre*, that he wou'd live and die by his Oaths to DARIUS, and afterward receiving the Victor with open Arms, and incouraging him in his Expedition againſt *Perſia*, by ſhewing him the Prophecies of DANIEL, and never imploying his Intereſt (for aught appears to the contrary) to divert the *Jews* from liſting in an Army that was to fight againſt his old Maſter. Theſe Particulars, 'tis poſſible, may be all true; but they appear with a very Romantick Air, and EUSEBIUS has done very wiſely in omitting them all in his Relation.

I HAVE been often at a loſs to determine, whether JOSEPHUS was the Author of this Story, or took it upon truſt from Tradition, or ſome *Jewiſh* Writer, and ſo was impos'd on himſelf. But after weighing every thing, I am charitably inclin'd to the latter Opinion. In the Hiſtory of his own Times, and even as high as the

riſe of the *Aſmonæan* Race, where he had good Memoirs to build on, he appears to be a Writer of extreme good Senſe and Sincerity, as well as of great Eloquence and Politeneſs. It muſt be own'd, that in his Account of the Scripture-Times, he has taken a bold liberty to vary from the Bible, to add, alter, retrench, and even ſometimes contradict it; which is a Fault for which no other Apology can be made, but that he was of the Sect of the *Phariſees*, and gave too much Credit to their trifling Traditions. However, in the main, that part of his Hiſtory is tolerably exact: But when he comes to the Interval between the end of NEHEMIAH's Government, where the Old Teſtament breaks off, and the beginning of the *Aſmonæan* Race, which is the darkeſt Period of the *Jewiſh* Hiſtory, and takes up the end of the eleventh and the greateſt part of the twelfth Book of his *Antiquities*; there his Hiſtory is indeed a mere fardle of Fables. Nor do I even here condemn him for want of Honeſty and Sincerity, but pity his Misfortune that he had no better Lights to direct him than fabulous Traditions, and

the lying Legends of the *Helleniſtical Jews.* I am, Sir, *&c.*

Dr. PRIDEAUX's firſt Letter to Mr. MOYLE.

Dear Couſin,

I THANK you for your kind Letter, and the Pains you have taken about my Book. I ſhou'd have been glad of ſo learned a Friend near me, to whom I might have communicated this Hiſtory before it was printed. But now three Editions being publiſh'd of it, your Obſervations come too late to be of any uſe for the correcting of any thing that is miſtaken. However, I ſhou'd be glad to have all that you have obſerv'd; and if I live to ſee a fourth Edition, I ſhall be ſure to examine all that you ſhall ſuggeſt to be amiſs, and as I ſhall ſee Cauſe for it, make Corrections accordingly.

AS to your firſt Obſervation concerning the Eaſt-India *Trade, I perceive my*

good Couſin has not obſerv'd that all that I ſay of it is of the Trade by Sea, and not of the Trade by Land. I thought no Reader wou'd have underſtood it otherwiſe; but ſince you have, I ſhall, in the ſecond Part, where I ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak of this matter again, put in ſuch Words as ſhall prevent all miſunderſtanding of this matter.

AS to what you write of ZOROASTRES, *I am of nothing more ſure in antient Hiſtory than that he was never King of* Bactria, *or any other than a jugling Impoſtor; and that the time of his flouriſhing was in the time of* DARIUS HYSTASPES: *and all the* Greeks *that ſay any thing to the purpoſe, agree in this time. For his being King of* Bactria, *and his making war with* NINUS, *there is no Authority but that of* JUSTIN's, *and thoſe who have wrote from him. All the* Greeks *ſpeak otherwiſe of him, and ſome give him a very fabulous Antiquity. But ſince you deſire only to have it prov'd to you, that he was not antienter than the time of* DARIUS HYSTASPES, *I will ſend you no further than to the Place in the*

Proem to DIOGENES LAERTIUS, *which I have quoted: there the Succeſſors of* ZOROASTRES *being nam'd,* OSTANES *is reckon'd the firſt of them, and became into* Greece *with* XERXES. SUIDAS *calls him* Περσομήδης, *but there were no* Perſomedians *before* CYRUS *united* Media *and* Perſia *together.* SUIDAS, *I confeſs, is no old Author, but his Collection is made out of thoſe that were ſo, and many of thoſe he us'd are now loſt. That he is made Cotemporary with* PYTHAGORAS, *is another Reaſon for the ſame thing. That Paſſage which you refer to in* ARNOBIUS, *if it proves any thing, it proves him to be Cotemporary with* CYRUS. *And* APULEIUS's *placing him in the time of* CAMBYSES *ſufficiently, ſhows there was then an Opinion that he liv'd about that time: and putting all this together, I think it is not to be doubted but that whom others call* ZABRATUS, ZARATUS, ZARAS, ZAROES, NAZARATUS, *&c. is the ſame with* ZOROASTRES, *the Character of the Perſon, as well as the Similitude of the Names, proving this Opinion. Perchance* PORPHYRIUS *might think* ZABRATUS *and* ZOROASTRES

to

to be two different Perſons; but this doth not prove them ſo, PORPHYRY *living many hundreds of Years after. All that I aim to prove by theſe Teſtimonies, is, that the beſt Evidence we have from among the* Greeks *and* Latins, *for the time of* ZOROASTRES, *placeth him about the time where I have put him. But as to the exact Chronology of all his Actions, (which is not to be found in this, or any matter among the antient* Greeks) *I acknowledge I follow the Eaſtern Writers, whoſe Books are all full of him; and that not from* oral Tradition, *as you ſuppoſe, but antient Authors. The* Arabs *indeed had no Learning till after the time of* MAHOMET; *but the* Perſians *had; and from very antient times: And therefore, I believe no* Arab *Author, as to this matter, any further than he writes from the* Perſians; *and if the* Perſians *have Writings of this matter, of above two thouſand Years ſtanding, why ſhou'd they not be believ'd as well as* HERODOTUS, *or* THUCYDIDES? ZOROASTRES's *own Books are ſtill extant among the* Magians *in* Perſia *and* India; *and from them are all the Accounts that*

in the East *are given of him. And his Books being of the ſame ſacred Regard among them, as the* Alcoran *is among the* Mahometans, *it is not hard to conceive they ſhou'd be preſerv'd with the ſame Care. As to* TEXEIRA, *it is not a Tranſlation, but a ſhort Abſtract of* EMIR CONDA's Perſian *Hiſtory; that Hiſtory is ten times as big. And tho that Author ſhou'd ſay nothing of* ZOROASTRES, *or* ZERDUSHT, *as they call him, this wou'd not prove there was no ſuch Perſon, any more than if the conteſted Paſſage in* JOSEPHUS *were given up, concerning our Saviour, it wou'd prove that there was no ſuch Perſon as Jeſus Chriſt, becauſe then there wou'd be no mention of him in that Hiſtory. If there be no ſuch mention of* ZERDUSHT *in* EMIR CONDA, *good Reaſon may be given for it:* EMIR CONDA *was a* Perſian Mahometan, *and with them nothing can be in greater Contempt than the* Magians *are in* Perſia; *and that might be Cauſe enough for him to take no notice either of them or their Prophet.*

I BEG your Pardon, I have not time to go over all your Papers: Others, as well as you, call for the ſecond Part of my Hiſtory; and being now in the laſt Scene of my Life, and almoſt at the end of that, I have little time to ſpare from this Work; which, for the gratifying of you and others, I wou'd gladly finiſh before I die. But if I live to finiſh it, and another Edition ſhou'd be publiſh'd of the firſt Part, I will then thorowly examine all that you ſhall offer, but think my Opinion, as to the time of ZOROASTRES, *to be too well founded ever to be alter'd by me. I am,* &c.

Norwich, Octob. 14. 1716.

Mr.

Mr. MOYLE's *Anſwer.*

LETTER V.

SIR,

—IN the next place, you wou'd bring ZOROASTRES down as low as the Age of CYRUS, by the help of a half Citation from a nameleſs Author in SUIDAS, who ſtyles him a *Perſomedian*; but immediately adds, that he flouriſh'd five hundred Years before the *Trojan* War, that is, a thouſand Years before CYRUS: which plainly ſhows that STANLEY, MARSHAM, and **** are miſtaken in the meaning of the Word *Perſomedes*, which you ſuppoſe to have been never heard of till the Union of the two Kingdoms of *Media* and *Perſia*, under CYRUS, ſince you ſee it mention'd a thouſand Years before. And if the Authority of SUIDAS's Author is good for one Circumſtance of the Story, 'tis good for both. This ſingle Argument from SUIDAS ſufficiently overturns your Interpretation of the

Word *Perſomedes*; but I ſhall add ſome other Proofs. In the firſt place, I deny that the Word *Perſomedia*, or *Perſomedes*, is to be met with in all the Geographers or Hiſtorians (as MARSHAM himſelf confeſſes) or any where elſe but in this ſingle Paſſage, where 'tis us'd in a quite different Senſe from what you give it, as I ſhall ſhow hereafter. Nor was there any ſuch thing after CYRUS united the Monarchy of the *Medes* and *Perſians*: For *Media*, after the Reign of CYRUS, was as much a Province of *Perſia* as any of their other Conqueſts. All the old Writers, with one conſent, agree that CYRUS conquer'd *Media*, and put an end to the Empire of the *Medes*, except XENOPHON in his CYROPÆDIA; which PLATO, CICERO, AUSONIUS, and all Antiquity, who were the beſt Judges, conſider'd as a Romance. And that XENOPHON himſelf deſign'd it for ſuch, I am fully perſuaded from a remarkable Paſſage of * his, which none of the Criticks that I have met with have taken notice of. He there expreſly affirms that the *Medes*

* Ἀναβ. iii. 182, 3.

were

were ſubdu'd, and diſpoſſeſs'd of their Empire by the *Perſians*, and relates ſeveral remarkable Particulars of the laſt War between the Kings of *Perſia* and *Media*. He has not given us their Names indeed, but 'tis plain he cou'd have no other in his Eye but CYRUS and ASTYAGES; for he relates it as an antient Fact, and therefore it can never be underſtood of the Revolt of the *Medes* under DARIUS NOTHUS, which happen'd but ſix or ſeven Years before. This Account is a flat Contradiction to the whole tenour of the *Cyropædia*, and is a Demonſtration that XENOPHON did not intend it for a true Hiſtory, but the Model of a good Prince.

THAT *Perſia*, properly ſo call'd, was alone the *Domicilium Imperii*, and that the *Medes* were not joint Sharers with them in the Empire, appears from the Revolt of the *Medes* under DARIUS NOTHUS, to recover their antient Sovereignty; which is mention'd by HERODOTUS *, and by † XENOPHON, and from the Dying-Speech of ‡ CAMBYSES,

* i. 35. † In Ἑλλ. i. 255. ‡ Herod. iii. 119.

in

in which he conjures the *Perſians* not to ſuffer the Empire to be transferr'd again to the *Medes*. The ſame is confirm'd by the Form of CYRUS's * Edict, where he only takes the Style and Title of King of *Perſia*, and from innumerable other Teſtimonies which 'twou'd be endleſs to produce. 'Tis true, we often meet in THUCYDIDES, HERODOTUS and other Writers, with the Words τὰ μηδικὰ, μηδισμὸς, and μηδίζειν, where the *Perſians* are plainly meant: but nothing can be gather'd from the uſe of theſe Terms, but that thoſe Writers conſider'd *Media* as the moſt conſiderable Province of the *Perſian* Monarchy, and which had formerly been poſſeſs'd of the † Empire of *Aſia*; and call the new Empire that had been rais'd on its Ruins by the old Name, tho 'twas in different Hands. In like manner HORACE, PROPERTIUS, and LUCAN have call'd the *Parthians Medes*, tho there is not the leaſt pretence of a Suppoſition that the *Medes* and *Parthians* had been ever united or incorporated into one Nation. And the ſame Anſwer will ſerve

* Ezra i. 2. † Strabo xi. 525.

for

for the Arguments MARSHAM has urg'd from the Book of ESTHER. As for the Objection of STANLEY and MARSHAM, that *Perſia* made no figure in the World before the Time of CYRUS, 'tis very true; but ZOROASTRES might be born in *Perſia* for all that. The Name and Nation of the *Perſians* are elder than the *Trojan* War, as appears from * DIODORUS, † HERODOTUS, ‡ EUSTATHIUS, ** SALLUST, †† PLINY, ‡‡ STEPHANUS, and *** APOLLODORUS.

HAVING ſaid thus much againſt your Senſe of the Word *Perſomedes*, I'll now give you my own, which I borrow'd from ††† SCALIGER. He ſuppoſes it to ſignify a half *Perſian* and half *Mede*, his Father being of one Nation and his Mother of another; as CYRUS is ſtyl'd a *Mule* by the Oracle in ‡‡‡ HERODOTUS, and by MEGASTHENES in ABYDENUS, for the ſame Reaſon. Biſhop **** USHER un-

---

* L. ii. p. 109. † L. vii. 257, 274.
‡ Ad Dionyſium, v. 1056. ** De Bello Jugurth. c. 21.
†† L. v. 8. ‡‡ In Πέρσαι. *** L. ii. 4.
††† Ad Fragmenta, p. 20. ‡‡‡ L. i. 13.
**** Ad A. P. J. 4115.

derſtands

derſtands the Word in the ſame Senſe. This is confirm'd by * CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, who calls him a *Perſian*, and a little lower in the ſame † Book calls him a *Mede*. And theſe different Accounts can't be well reconcil'd upon any other Suppoſition, but that ZOROASTRES was deſcended from both Nations. Nor is it ſtrange that a ſingle Perſon ſhou'd borrow his National Name from two different Provinces, when there are Examples enough in Hiſtory of whole Nations who have taken their Names in the ſame manner. The *Gallo-Græci* of *Aſia*, were ſo call'd from their being a mix'd Race, deſcended by Intermarriages of *Gauls* and ‡ *Aſiatick Greeks*. The *Celtiberi* of *Spain* borrow'd that Name from the *Celtæ* and *Iberi*, from whom they were jointly ** deſcended. There are many other Inſtances of the ſame kind, as the *Gallo-Scythæ*, mention'd by †† PLUTARCH, the ‡‡ *Liby Ægyptii*, the *** *Liby*

---

* In Strom. i. p. 357. † P. 399.
‡ Flor. ii. 11. Liv. xxxviii. 17.
** Diodor. v. 309. Appian. Iberica, p. 256.
†† In Mario, p. 752. ‡‡ Mela i. 4. Plin. v. 8.
*** Plin. v. 4. Liv. xxv. 40. Ptolom. iv. 3. Scymnus Chius, v. 196.

Phæ-

Phænices; to which I may add the *Medo Bithyni* mention'd by * STRABO, and the *Armeno Chalybes*. Many other Examples of compound Ἔθνεα might be produc'd, and all in the ſame Senſe I have given to the Word *Perſomedes*; but theſe Authorities are ſufficient to warrant my Interpretation, and to prove it agreeable to the Analogy and Uſage of the *Greek* Tongue. As for Sir JOHN MARSHAM, who firſt ſtarted the other Interpretation, and is follow'd by STANLEY, I don't wonder at him; for his whole Scheme is to derive the Original of all Arts and Sciences from the *Egyptians*, and in that view he has brought down ZOROASTRES by Head and Shoulders ſome Ages lower than the *Egyptian Magicians*, contrary to the Authority of † PLINY, ARNOBIUS, and ‡ USHER.

I WONDER you ſhou'd inſiſt on the Authority of APULEIUS for an Opinion which he expreſly contradicts, and which you own to be inconſiſtent with the Chronology of PYTHAGORAS. As

* C. vii. 295. † C. 30. 1. ‡ Ad A. P. J. 3447.

to

to the Article of ZARATUS, you have given up one of your Authors, PORPHYRY; and by the ſame rule you muſt give up CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, who in the* ſame Place where he mentions NAZARATUS or ZARATUS, names ZOROASTRES as a different Man, and of a different Nation; and PLUTARCH, who mentions them as diſtinct Perſons: for he makes the firſt Cotemporary with PYTHAGORAS, and the laſt ſome thouſand Years elder. And 'tis very ſtrange you will have ZARATUS and ZOROASTRES to be all one, tho your own Authors expreſly deny it. Upon the whole matter, I can't find that you have one ſingle Teſtimony from any *Greek* or *Latin* Writer, in favour of your Hypotheſis, but all muſt be reſolv'd into the Authority of the Eaſtern Writers, whom I think unworthy of Credit.

I HAVE left the Age of ZOROASTRES at large, without fixing it to any particular Date, by reaſon of the uncertainty of the old Writers; nor did I ever

* Strom. i. p. 357. † De Iſide & Oſir. p. 659.

affirm that he was King of *Bactria*: But I don't think TROGUS was the only Author who has made him ſo, for HERMIPPUS, a very antient Writer, makes him a * *Bactrian*; and Biſhop USHER thinks † ZOROASTRES to be the true Reading in DIODORUS, and not OXYATRES; which I ſtill think may be fairly inferr'd from that corrupt Paſſage of ARNOBIUS, which I cited in my Letter. You ſuppoſe that the Writers who have carry'd the Age of ZOROASTRES to a great Antiquity, have ſaid nothing to the purpoſe, tho they are Authors of the greateſt Fame and Antiquity. In that number is XANTHUS LYDIUS, who was as antient as you make ZOROASTRES, and is prais'd by a very good Judge, DIONYSIUS HALICARNASSEUS, as an excellent Antiquary, and makes him many hundred Years elder than himſelf. ARISTOTLE, and EUDOXUS are old Writers, and of the greateſt Reputation for Judgment and Integrity: And if their Accounts carry him too high, 'tis at leaſt good Proof of his great Antiquity. HER-

* Apud Arnob. *i.*

† Ad A. P. J. 3447.

MIPPUS,

MIPPUS, who flouriſh'd a little later, is another of my Authors; to ſay nothing of PLUTARCH, PLINY, HERMODORUS, and many others, who, if laid in the Scale, will infinitely outweigh the Teſtimony of APULEIUS and SUIDAS, if they really favour'd your Hypotheſis, which I am far from believing. I ſhall add only one Author, becauſe I think he has eſcap'd all the modern Criticks who have writ of ZOROASTRES, NICOLAUS DAMASCENUS. He tells us, * that *the* Perſians *when they were burning* CROESUS, *bethought themſelves of the Oracles* (or Laws) *of* ZOROASTRES, *which forbad ſuch a Profanation of Fire*; and adds, that *'twas an antient Prohibition:* which ſhows that ZOROASTRES was a great deal more antient than CYRUS. By the *Oracles* of ZOROASTRES, I don't mean that Rhapſody of myſtical Nonſenſe publiſh'd by PATRICIUS, but the Book of his Laws, or the Syſtem of Religious Worſhip; in the ſame Senſe as the Word λόγια is us'd, *Acts* vii. 38. *Rom.* iii. 2.

* Excerpta Valeſiana, p. 460.

I AM ſurpriz'd to ſee you ſend me to DIOGENES LAERTIUS's Proem, which makes directly againſt you. The Paſſage you refer to is taken from XANTHUS LYDIUS, who flouriſh'd, according to SUIDAS, under DARIUS HYSTASPES; which is confirm'd by * ATHENÆUS, who ſays he was cited by EPHORUS, who makes him elder than HERODOTUS. This Account all the modern Criticks are agreed in, as VOSSIUS, DU PIN, MENAGE, and HARDUIN in his Notes on the Authors cited by PLINY: ſo that, by your reckoning, he muſt be Cotemporary with ZOROASTRES. The Relation which DIOGENES borrows from him, is as follows: XANTHUS LYDIUS makes ſix hundred Years between ZOROASTRES and XERXES's Expedition into *Greece*, and that after him there was a Succeſſion of many *Magi*, *viz.* the OSTANÆ, ASTRAPSYCHI, GOBRYÆ, and PAZATÆ. What follows is an Addition of DIOGENES LAERTIUS; for 'tis impoſſible that a Writer who flouriſh'd under DARIUS,

* P. 515.

and

and his Son XERXES, cou'd mention the Subverſion of the *Perſian* Monarchy by ALEXANDER; which I wonder MENAGE and the Criticks han't taken notice of. I am at a loſs to imagine what Conſequence you can draw from this Paſſage in favour of your Hypotheſis. 'Tis apparent that XANTHUS LYDIUS, who, upon your Suppoſition, was equal with ZOROASTRES, places him ſix hundred Years before the Expedition of XERXES, which he never wou'd have done had they both liv'd in the ſame Age. He himſelf was a Subject of *Perſia*, and cou'd be no Stranger to their Religion, Laws, or Hiſtory, eſpecially to Facts in his own Memory. As for OSTANES being his immediate Succeſſor, which is the Argument you inſiſt on, 'tis plain he cou'd not be above forty or fifty Years younger than his Maſter, and conſequently he muſt be many hundred Years elder than XERXES. But if you believe, upon the Credit of XANTHUS, that OSTANES was the Succeſſor of ZOROASTRES, why won't you believe him when he places ZOROASTRES ſix hundred Years earlier than XERXES? If you admit of one Article

of the Relation, you ought, by the ſame parity of Reaſon, to allow of the other; ſince both of them depend on the ſame Authority, and one is every whit as probable as the other. Nor does XANTHUS ſay that ZOROASTRES was follow'd by OSTANES, but by the OSTANÆ in the plural number, that is, by a Succeſſion of ſeveral of that Name, and ſo of the reſt that are afterward mention'd, as * A. FABRICIUS rightly underſtands it, and † SUIDAS mentions an intire Succeſſion of that name. ‡ Here is too long a train of Succeſſors for ſo ſhort a Period of time as paſs'd between DARIUS and XERXES's Expedition, in whoſe Reign XANTHUS wrote, or thereabout. DIOGENES indeed, by an abſurd Gloſs or Addition to XANTHUS's Relation, has inlarg'd the time, and was led into that Miſtake, I ſuppoſe, by having heard of an OSTANES who flouriſh'd under ALEXANDER, as we are told by ** PLINY. Thus, Sir, I

* Bibl. Græc. i. 14. † In Ὀστάνης.

‡ Vid. etiam Geſnerum & Worth ad Tatianum, c. 28. & Scaliger. ad Græc. Euſeb. Chron. p. 420.

** L. xxx. i.

think

think I have abundantly prov'd that many of the Succeſſors of ZOROASTRES bore the Name of OSTANES; and 'tis as manifeſt from this Paſſage of XANTHUS, that the firſt of theſe OSTANÆ, who was his immediate Succeſſor, cou'd not be the OSTANES who came with XERXES into *Greece*, becauſe he makes him many hundred Years elder: Which Account is confirm'd by APULEIUS, in his Apology, who carries his Age to a much greater height; for he makes him more antient than MOSES and JAMNES.

AS for the *Perſian* Writers, I know nothing of them but from TEXIERA, who tells us that MIRKONDE has the Reputation of being their beſt Hiſtorian, who may be well ſuppos'd to have collected his Materials from their moſt antient and approv'd Authors; whom, for that Reaſon, I can never believe to be above two thouſand Years old: For 'tis impoſſible that Writers who flouriſh'd under the *Perſian* Empire, cou'd have been ſo groſly ignorant of the Succeſſion, Deſcent, Lives and Actions of their own Kings. This Charge upon them you muſt allow to be

true, unleſs you are reſolv'd to give up all the old *Greek* and *Latin* Monuments, and the *Bible* into the bargain, and ſet up theſe ſorry *Romances* in their room. I can never believe their Book of their Law to be the ſame they had formerly, becauſe their Religion is not the ſame. I gave ſome Inſtances of it in my firſt Letter, which I ſhan't repeat, but only obſerve, that the preſent *Perſians*, according to your account, are downright *Deiſts*, whereas the old *Perſians* were moſt certainly *Polytheiſts* and *Idolaters*, as appears from the Places I cited in CLEMENS, and EPIPHANIUS: to which I ſhall add the Authority of a much better Writer, * STRABO, who liv'd in *Cappadocia*, where great numbers of the *Perſian* Sect reſided, and openly profeſs'd their Religion; and 'tis impoſſible that an Eye-witneſs, as he affirms of himſelf, cou'd be miſtaken in his account of their Worſhip. If you ask how their original Law came to be loſt, I anſwer, that 'tis very natural to ſuppoſe, that after ſo many Turns and Revolutions in *Perſia*, it might have the ſame Fate which

* L. xv. 733.

the

the *Jewiſh* Law ſo narrowly eſcap'd under JOSIAH, when there was but one Copy of it left in the World. Or perchance it might have the fortune of the leſſer Epiſtles of IGNATIUS, to be ſo chang'd by Additions and Interpolations, in courſe of time, as to become a quite different Law. As to their preſent Book of the Law, it appears by the Account of HERBERT, in his Travels, as to the Hiſtorical Part of it, to be ſuch a heap of ſilly Lyes and Legends, that I am apt to think the World has no great loſs of Dr. HYDE's Tranſlation. And * HUETIUS has given ſo many Inſtances of Facts and Doctrines manifeſtly taken from the Goſpels, and apply'd to ZOROASTRES, that no reaſonable Man can doubt of its being compos'd long ſince the riſe of Chriſtianity: And if it ſtill bears the Name of ZOROASTRES, tho forg'd ſo many Ages after him, that may be eaſily accounted for to any Man who has read the *Codex Apocryphus N. Teſtamenti*, publiſh'd by FABRICIUS, where he will meet with numerous Examples of mock Goſpels and Epiſtles, that were forg'd ſome Ages after

* P. 88.

the

the Death of the Authors to whom they are aſcrib'd, and as firmly believ'd by thoſe who receiv'd them as the *Zenda-verta* is by the *Perſians*. MIRCONDE, if a Bigot, ought the rather to have related the Impoſture of ZOROASTRES, in order to have expos'd it, as SANDERS and WARD have writ the Hiſtory of our Reformation, and as you have writ the Life of MAHOMET. The Argument from the Silence of MIRCONDE is no demonſtrative one, nor did I urge it as ſuch; but I thought it very natural to ſuppoſe, that if ſo memorable a Revolution in Religion had happen'd in the time of GORTORP, it cou'd never have eſcap'd MIRCONDE, in his Hiſtory of the Tranſactions of that Reign: But if † TEXEIRA is to be credited, ZOROASTRES was the ſame with ZOAKT, the ſixth King of *Perſia*, who, according to MIRCONDE, flouriſh'd many Ages before GORTORP.

I SHALL conclude all with one Obſervation, that your Hypotheſis wou'd have been more plauſible and conſiſtent,

† P. 31.

if

if you had ſuppos'd two ZOROASTRE's, the firſt the Founder of the *Perſian* Sect, who is mention'd by all the old *Greek* Writers, and the ſecond the Reviver or Reformer of the ſame Sect, for whom you have the Authority of the *Eaſtern* Hiſtorians, as far as it will go. Upon this Suppoſition, you wou'd have avoided a world of Difficulties and Objections, which are never to be got over on the foot you have now ſet it, without rejecting the Authority of the very beſt Writers of all Antiquity, which will never be allow'd by the Criticks.

Dr. PRIDEAUX's ſecond Letter.

Dear Couſin,

I HAVE receiv'd more of your Papers: To anſwer fully all that you object, wou'd require a Volume, which I have not Time or Strength to do, being almoſt worn out by Infirmity, caus'd by the Calamity I have ſuffer'd, and my advanc'd Age, as being now juſt upon the ſeventieth Year of my Life. This hath ſo far broken me, as to confine me wholly

to my Houſe, and moſt an end to my Chamber: Only ſince you preſs particularly about the Ἀνάβασις, *my Anſwer is, that* XENOPHON *was not the Author of that Book, but one* THEMISTOGENES *of* Syracuſe. *This* XENOPHON *himſelf ſaith, in the beginning of the third Book of his* Hellenics. *If you pleaſe to conſult* USHER's Annals, ſub Anno J. P. 4313, *you will find this there fully made out. I have indeed quoted that Book under the name of* XENOPHON, *becauſe of the common Opinion, which every where attributes it to him; but I think the Truth is otherwiſe. I perceive you hang much upon the matter of* ZOROASTRES: *but all that you object is built upon Miſtakes. If you do not place him where I have, where elſe will you place him? Will you put him with* PLUTARCH, *five thouſand Years before the War of* Troy; *or, with others, ſix thouſand Years before the Time of* PLATO? *Others indeed reduce the thouſands to hundreds, but all is Fable; for the Antients much affected a fabulous Antiquity for all they relate. They who put things lateſt are generally neareſt the Truth. It is eaſy in all ſuch matters*

matters to make Objections for pulling down, but then you ought to build up better in their ſtead. I write with a paralytical Hand, which makes Writing difficult to me; for which I alſo need your Pardon. I am, Dear Couſin, &c.

Norwich, Jan. 30. 1716.

Dr. PRIDEAUX's third Letter.

Dear Couſin,

THO my Hand be almoſt paſt writing, as you will ſufficiently ſee by this Letter, yet I cannot omit thanking you for the Kindneſs of your laſt. I hope e'er this you have receiv'd my Book. I am ſure it will no where find a more obſerving and judicious Reader than your ſelf: I had ſufficient Experience of this in your learned Remarks on the former Part. They have inſtructed me for the making ſome Alterations againſt another Edition; but however I cannot recede from placing the ZOROASTRES, *who was the* ZERDUSHT *of the* Perſians, *and*

the Author of the Book Zundaveſtow, *(which is the Bible of the* Magians) *in that very Age where my Book has plac'd him: To ſay otherwiſe wou'd be to contradict all the antient Hiſtories of the* Perſians, *and the general Tradition of all the* Eaſt. *What you object out of* XANTHUS LYDIUS, *who liv'd in that very Age in which I place* ZOROASTRES, *looks like an unanſwerable Argument; it being by no means likely that this Author ſhou'd aſſert* ZOROASTRES *to have liv'd ſix hundred Years before the Expedition of* XERXES, *if he was his Contemporary. One Anſwer hereto is, The Hiſtory that in the time of* DIOGENES LAERTUS, *went under the Name of* XANTHUS LYDIUS, *was none of his, but written by* DIONYSIUS SCYTOBRACHION, *who liv'd a little before the Time of* TULLY *and* JULIUS CÆSAR. *This* ATHENÆUS *tells us,* lib. xii. *and quotes for it* ARTEMON CASSANDREUS, *who wrote a Treatiſe on purpoſe to make a diſtinction of the genuine Authors from the ſpurious, which were then extant. But I am rather apt to think, with* PLINY, (lib. XXX. c. 1.) *that there were*

two

two ZOROASTRES's, *the elder of which was the Founder of the* Magian *Sect, and the other the Reformer; and that this latter was the* ZERDUSHT *of the* Perſians, *and liv'd in the Time where I have plac'd him.* PLINY, *in the Chapter laſt quoted, tells us of a* ZOROASTRES *who liv'd but a little before* (paulo ante hunc, *are his Words*) *that* OSTANES, *who came with* XERXES *into* Greece. PLATO, *in the tenth Book of his Politicks, ſpoke of a* ZOROASTRES, *who was* HERUS ARMENIUS, *a* Pamphylian. *This ſame was the* ARMENIUS PAMPHILUS, *who,* ARNOBIUS *tells us, was familiarly acquainted with* CYRUS, (*See* Clem. Alexand. Strom. v. p. 436. *Edit.* Hinſ. Arnob. lib. i. p. 31.) *I acknowledge the Paſſage in* ARNOBIUS *is very dark; but if it ſignifies any thing, it muſt ſignify thus much, That there was a* ZOROASTRES *who liv'd in the time of* CYRUS. *I may add hereto, that the Antiquity which moſt of the Antients among the* Greeks *and* Latins *attribute to* ZOROASTRES, *is notoriouſly fabulous, as that of five thouſand Years before the Wars of* Troy, *and another of ſix thouſand Years before the*

the time of PLATO, &c. *In moſt Pretences to Antiquity, it may go for a general Rule, that they who ſay the lateſt ſay the trueſt. As to your other Objection againſt* ALEXANDER's *having been at* Jeruſalem, *the Place you refer to in* PLINY, *manifeſtly makes againſt you; for the Words there plainly prove that* ALEXANDER *was then at* Jericho, *when that Inciſion was made in the Balſam Trees which he makes mention of; otherwiſe theſe Words,* Alexandro magno res ibi gerente, *wou'd be very impertinently inſerted. And if he were at* Jericho, *he cou'd not go from thence to* Gaza *without taking* Jeruſalem *in his way. The Words in* PLINY *to me plainly imply, that* ALEXANDER *was at* Jericho *when that Inciſion was made, and that it was made at that time, for his ſake, to gather ſome of the Balſam. That an extraordinary Providence has always attended that People, for their Preſervation, is manifeſt. That they are now in being is a ſufficient Proof hereof.* *I am,* &c.

Norwich, July 10. 1718.

Mr.

Mr. MOYLE's *Anſwer.*

LETTER VI.

Of ALEXANDER's *having been at* Jeruſalem.

SIR,

BISHOP USHER produc'd the Paſſage of PLINY you have quoted, to prove that ALEXANDER, after the taking of *Tyre*, invaded *Judea*. This I own'd, taking *Judea* in the largeſt Senſe of the Word, which includes *Paleſtine* properly ſo call'd; and conſequently *Gaza*, which ALEXANDER beſieg'd, and to that Siege I ſuppoſe PLINY alluded.

PLINY begins the 25th Chapter of the twelfth Book with theſe Words, *Sed omnibus odoribus præfertur Balſamum, uni terrarum Judææ conceſſum*, &c. From this Period to the Paſſage you cite, *viz. Alexandro Magno res ibi gerente*, there is no mention made of any Region,

Province, City or Town of *Judea*; and conſequently by all the Rules of Grammar and Conſtruction, *ibi* can be referr'd to nothing but *Judea*. For PLINY names the Country in general, without ſpecifying the particular quarter of *Judea*, where the Balſam-Tree grew. This he did in imitation of DIOSCORIDES, who ſays the very ſame: For as to THEOPHRASTUS, he leaves it more at large, by ſaying that it grew in a Vale of *Syria*. But *the Balſam-Trees*, you ſay, *grew in the Gardens of* Jericho. 'Tis very true; but PLINY does not tell us ſo, and 'tis highly probable that he did not know it, or at leaſt had forgot it: For he has twice mention'd * *Jericho*, and deſcribes it in both Places as remarkable for its Groves of Palm-Trees, without ſaying a Word of the Balſam-Tree, which was the diſtinguiſhing Rarity of *Jericho*, as being peculiar to that City only, and the moſt valuable Plant in the World: And PLINY cou'd not have fail'd to take notice of it, if he had ever heard, or at leaſt remember'd, that the Balſam-Tree grew there. It may be objected,

* L. v. 14. xiii. 4.

that

that TROGUS and STRABO, both elder Writers than PLINY, have plac'd the Balſam-Garden at *Jericho*, from whom he might have learn'd it. As to the firſt, the Text is doubtful, one Manuſcript only favouring the vulgar Reading; and 'tis uncertain whether the Word *Hierichus* is TROGUS's, or his Abridger JUSTIN's. And beſides, PLINY has never cited the Hiſtory of TROGUS, tho he has mention'd his other Works. And as for STRABO, he has never once quoted him in the whole courſe of his Hiſtory: from whence one may fairly infer, that he had never read thoſe Authors, or at leaſt had forgot that Particular in them.

THIS Paſſage PLINY has borrow'd (as THEOPHRASTUS has done the latter part of it) from an Author not now extant: but by the mention of ALEXANDER's being in thoſe parts at that time, one may eaſily gueſs in what Age he liv'd. He has more than once cited the *Comites Alexandri*, for the Diſcoveries they had made of new Plants and other Rarities, during their Attendance upon ALEXANDER, in his Eaſtern Expedition; and 'tis

very natural to ſuppoſe, that their Curioſity might lead them to viſit ſo celebrated a Plant as the Balſam, while ALEXANDER lay with his Army in thoſe Parts: And from their Relations, I am perſuaded, PLINY took this Circumſtance of his Deſcriptions. So that there is no neceſſity to infer from this place, that ALEXANDER had been at *Jericho* himſelf. He had too much Work upon his hands, at this juncture, to ſpend a whole Summer's day in trying Experiments upon the bleeding of the Balſam-Tree. Beſides, *Jericho* lay out of his way from *Tyre* to *Jeruſalem*, whither JOSEPHUS makes him march directly, tho not indeed from *Tyre*, but from *Gaza*. Nor did he wage any War in *Judea*, properly ſo call'd, which is imply'd in PLINY; for your own Author tells us, that the whole Country ſubmitted without ſtriking a Blow, and receiv'd him with open Arms.

I AM ſo far from thinking that ALEXANDER was ever at *Jericho*, that I don't believe he ever was in any part of *Judea*, ſtrictly ſo nam'd. 'Tis moſt probable that he took the direct Road to *Tyre*,

along the Sea-Shore thro *Phœnicia* and *Paleſtina*, properly ſo call'd, to *Gaza*. JOSEPHUS makes him march directly from *Tyre* to *Gaza*. The ſame is plainly imply'd in ARRIAN; and CURTIUS ſays that he order'd HEPHÆSTION, with the Fleet under his command, to coaſt along the Shore of *Phœnicia*, while he came himſelf with the Land Army to *Gaza*, without making the leaſt mention of any Action that interven'd in his March thither. And is it poſſible to ſuppoſe that if he had reduc'd *Judea* by the way, the Conqueſt of ſo important a Province wou'd have been paſs'd over in ſilence by CURTIUS, who is ſo very particular in the relation of the inconſiderable Exploits of ALEXANDER? This confirms what I obſerv'd from ARRIAN in my firſt Letter, that *Judea* had ſubmitted to ALEXANDER, before he mov'd from *Tyre*.

I WON'T repeat the falſe Dates and other Inconſiſtencies which I have diſcover'd in JOSEPHUS's Relation. I conſider the whole as a Religious *Romance*, to which you ſay the *Jews* of thoſe Times were much addicted; and perhaps 'twas

forg'd in the ſame Mint with ARISTÆUS's Hiſtory of the Septuagint, which you have ſo admirably well confuted.

THE Explication I have given of thoſe Texts of Scripture which make mention of the Empire of the *Medes* and *Perſians*, is confirm'd by a parallel Paſſage of POLYÆNUS, in his Dedication to ANTONINUS and VERUS, where he preſages that they wou'd obtain the Victory over the *Perſians* and *Parthians*. In this laſt caſe, there is not the leaſt Pretence for a voluntary Coalition between theſe two Nations, or that they were joint Sharers in the Sovereignty. 'Tis poſſible indeed that the *Perſians* might then have a nominal King or Viceroy, as they had in STRABO's time; but 'tis certain he was ſubject to the *Parthians* till ARTAXERXES ſhook off the Yoke, and reſtor'd the *Perſians* to their Independence and Empire. I can't imagine what other Account can be given for theſe two Nations being mention'd together on this occaſion, than what I have aſſign'd for the *Medes* and *Perſians* being jointly nam'd in the Bible.

ARCH-

ARCHBISHOP USHER's Conceit, that THEMISTOGENES was the Author of XENOPHON's Ἀνάβασις, againſt the Conſent of ſuch a Cloud of Witneſſes as he has produc'd, is a very odd Paradox. To the nine Authors he has nam'd, all of unqueſtionable Credit, I ſhall add eleven more, *viz.* * ÆLIAN, † LUCIAN, ‡ STRABO, STEPHANUS, EUSTATHIUS *in Dionyſium*, HESYCHIUS, POLLUX, HARPOCRATION *paſſim*, AMMONIUS the Grammarian in ἀποδέδραι, SUIDAS, and TZETZES. Is it poſſible for any antient Fact to be better atteſted? The only Argument USHER inſiſts on, is fairly accounted for by PLUTARCH, whom he cites, and by ** TZETZES. 'Tis true, they don't agree in their Reaſons for XENOPHON's giving THEMISTOGENES the Honour of this Hiſtory; but their Reaſons are very conſiſtent with each other, and are very properly brought if true. All the modern Authors of any note, follow the Authority of the antient, who were

* L. vii. 14.
† In Somnio, p. 11, 12.
‡ L. viii. p. 387.
** In Chil. vii. 154.

certainly the beſt Judges in this Controverſy. But ſetting aſide the Teſtimonies of the old and new Criticks, the Conformity of the Style, and the way of thinking in this Book, with the reſt of XENOPHON's Works, is to me a Demonſtration, that either XENOPHON was the Author of this Piece, or THEMISTOGENES of all the reſt that are father'd on XENOPHON. The Biſhop is ſingular in his Opinion; not one Critick, that I know of, having thought fit to follow him: But the Biſhop's Conduct, upon this occaſion, is eaſily accounted for. The Authority of the *Cyropædia*, for Reaſons which are very obvious, was to be maintain'd right or wrong, tho all Antiquity thought it a Romance; and his Ἀνάβασις, which every body knew to be a true Hiſtory, ſo groſly contradicting it, was a plain Proof that XENOPHON deſign'd it as ſuch. To evade this Difficulty, and to vindicate the Authority of the *Cyropædia*, the Biſhop was forc'd to father the Ἀνάβασις on a different Author.

ATHENÆUS indeed tells us, that ARTEMO CASSANDREUS affirms, that the

the *Lydiaca*, which paſs'd under the name of XANTHUS, was writ by DIONYSIUS SCYTHOBRACHION: But he is ſo far from being of ARTEMO's Opinion, that he reproaches him with Ignorance, in not knowing that this Book had been cited by EPHORUS, and that the Example of XANTHUS ſet HERODOTUS upon writing his Hiſtory. Both theſe Authors flouriſh'd Ages before DIONYSIUS SCYTHOBRACHION, as you very rightly obſerve; and the Paſſage of SUETONIUS, from which *CASAUBON infers the contrary, is a Demonſtration againſt himſelf. So that 'tis plain ATHENÆUS thought the *Lydiaca* genuine. 'Tis cited as ſuch by STRABO, and by DIONYSIUS HALICARNASSENSIS, the beſt Critick of the politeſt Age that ever was, who at the ſame time gives a very great Character of the Author: to ſay nothing of PLINY, SUIDAS, STEPHANUS and others, who make frequent mention of this Hiſtory, without the leaſt Suſpicion of its being counterfeit. So that we have all the external Evidence can be deſir'd to prove it

* De Grammat. illuſt. c. 7.

genuine:

genuine: and as for internal Proofs, there are none to be had, there being nothing extant of this Hiſtory but a few Scraps, that can give us no light one way or other. But after all, allowing this Hiſtory to be a ſpurious Work, it won't affect my Argument at all; for I don't ſuppoſe the Paſſage in DIOGENES LAERTIUS we are diſputing about, was borrow'd from the *Lydian* Hiſtory of XANTHUS, but from another Work of his that treated of the Doctrine and Principles of the *Magians*, and is cited by *CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS. So ſay VOSSIUS, DU PIN, HARDUIN and MENAGE; and 'tis infinitely more natural to ſuppoſe that he mention'd the Age of ZOROASTRES in a Book which treated of a Sect of which he was the Founder, than in the Hiſtory of the *Lydian* Antiquities, in which ZOROASTRES was no ways concern'd. ARTEMO an obſcure Writer, againſt a Cloud of Witneſſes.

BUT your other Anſwer is far better, and I think you are extremely in the right

* L. iii. 515.

to

to ſuppoſe two ZOROASTRES's. 'Tis the Expedient I propos'd to you in my laſt Letter upon this Subject; and I think it impoſſible to reconcile the *Grecian* and *Perſian* Accounts upon any other Hypotheſis. This will render your whole Relation infinitely more probable; and your making the laſt ZOROASTRES not the Founder but the Reformer of the *Magian* Sect, will, in ſome meaſure, account for the little mention that is made of him by the *Weſtern* Writers; it being poſſible that ſome of the Actions and Doctrines of the latter, may, thro' miſtake, have been father'd on the former ZOROASTRES, who gave the firſt riſe to that Sect; and for that Reaſon was moſt celebrated by the *Greek* Writers. Give me leave to obſerve a Miſtake you have made in this Subject, in the firſt * Part, which ſhou'd be corrected in another Edition: You there cite JAMBLICHUS, to prove that PYTHAGORAS was the Scholar of ZOROASTRES; but JAMBLICHUS, in the Place you mention, ſays only in general,

* Part I. Book IV. p. 228.

that

that PYTHAGORAS convers'd with the *Magi*, without naming ZOROASTRES, or any other of that Sect.

Part II. Book VIII. p. 588. 8*vo*.

That OCTAVIANUS's *Poſterity never enjoy'd the Empire.*

AGRIPPINA the Daughter of JULIA, AUGUSTUS's Daughter, was the Mother of CALIGULA the Emperor, and of AGRIPPINA the Mother of the Emperor NERO: So that CALIGULA was the great Grandſon of AUGUSTUS, and NERO his great great Grandſon.

Dr.

Dr. PRIDEAUX's fourth Letter.

Dear Couſin,

I DO moſt heartily thank you for your kind Letter, eſpecially for the Obſervations which you have ſent me of my Miſtakes in the laſt Part of my Hiſtory. I muſt confeſs that about OCTAVIUS's *Poſterity is a very great one. It is a downright Blunder of my old Head, and I am glad ſo accurate and learned a Reader has not obſerv'd more of them. This makes me hope that no more ſuch have eſcap'd me. I have mended this, and all the others you have taken notice of; only I cannot make* SOCRATES *a* Sodomite. *The Place in* Juvenal *which you mention, reflects on him for his Affection to* ALCIBIADES, *as if that were a* Sodomitical *Amour. I am paſt labouring any further, being now paſt the ſeventieth Year of my Age. If I out-live the enſuing Winter, it is more than I expect, or indeed deſire; for I have now upon me thoſe Decays both of Body and Mind as make*

make me fully ſenſible —Gravis eſt & dura Senectus. *Every body cannot live ſo long as my Aunt* M. M. *tho perchance I might have liv'd much longer, and in full Vigour, had not my great Calamity come athwart me; conſidering that, it is much that I have laſted ſo long. I bleſs God for all his Mercies hitherto.*

I am, Dear Couſin, &c.

Norwich, Sept. 6. 1711.

THE

THE MIRACLE OF THE Thundering Legion EXAMIN'D:

In ſeveral LETTERS between

Mr. MOYLE and Mr. *K*—.

LETTERS

Concerning the

Thundering Legion.

LETTER I.

SIR,

AT length I ſend you the Diſcourſe I promis'd you on the Miracle of the *Thundering-Legion*. I have taken the whole Relation of the Story in pieces, as 'tis given us by EUSEBIUS, (*Hiſt. Eccl.* v. 5.) and examin'd every particular Circumſtance

apart; and, if they appear to be all falſe, I preſume you'll reject the whole for a Forgery. I ſhall begin with

ARTICLE I.

That there was not an entire Legion of Chriſtians in the Army of ANTONINUS.

'TIS highly improbable, that there was an entire Legion of Chriſtians in ANTONINUS's Army; as EUSEBIUS and APOLLINARIS plainly intimate: So VALESIUS underſtands them, and SCALLIGER, (*ad Euſeb. Chr.* p. 223.) and the ſame is expreſly affirm'd by XIPHILIN and NICEPHORUS. VALESIUS, tho an Advocate for the Miracle, ſuſpects the Truth of the Circumſtance, which is indeed very unlikely on all Accounts.

Firſt, 'TIS improbable that the Chriſtians, in that Age, were ſo numerous as to furniſh the Army with whole Legions. What TERTULLIAN ſays of their numbers thirty Years afterward, (*in Apol.* c. 37.) is only a Flight of his *African* Elo-

Eloquence; as Biſhop BURNET obſerves in his Letters. And it appears by the Eſtimate the Biſhop has made of their numbers, ſeventy Years after the Death of ANTONINUS, and after a long Toleration, that they did not exceed the fortieth part of the Inhabitants, even in *Rome* it ſelf, which was the head Quarters of Chriſtianity. And their numbers were much leſs, in proportion, in the Country Villages, where the Legions were commonly rais'd and recruited, (*Veget.* i. 3.) Chriſtianity chiefly flouriſhing in the great Towns, and Paganiſm prevailing in the Country; from whence it took its Name, after 'twas quite loſt in the Cities.

THIS ſingle Circumſtance is to me as hard of Digeſtion as the main Story it ſelf. Was it the Effect of Chance or of Deſign? Is it likely that Chance, from ſo many millions of Heathens, ſhou'd ſingle out ſix thouſand Chriſtians, and throw them all into a Body? Is it probable that the Emperor wou'd truſt Arms in the hands of ſuch a Body of Men, whoſe Religion he was reſolv'd to ruin? And 'tis equally abſurd to imagine, that

the Chriſtians wou'd ſhew ſuch Zeal for the Service of a perſecuting Prince.

I AM ſo far from believing that there was a Legion of Chriſtians, that I think it highly probable, from the Principles and Practice of that Age, that there were few or none at all in the Army.

'TIS plain from ATHENAGORAS, (*c.* 30.) that the Chriſtians of that Age had ſuch an Abhorrence of Murder and Bloodſhed, that they declin'd appearing at the Execution of Malefactors, how juſtly ſoever they ſuffer'd; and 'twas for that Reaſon, among others, they ſhunn'd the bloody Shows of the *Gladiators* and *Beſtiarii*. The ſame is confirm'd by THEOPHILUS ANTIOCH. (*ad Autol.* l. iii.) and MINUTIUS FELIX expreſly ſays, *Nobis homicidium nec videre fas eſt.* The two firſt of theſe Authors, moſt certainly, flouriſh'd in the Reign of ANTONINUS; and the Age of MINUTIUS, tho leſs certain, has been fix'd, with great Probability, to the latter end of the ſame Reign, by Mr. DODWELL, (*de paucit. Martyr.* c.) Nor can that be call'd the private Senſe

of ſome Doctors of that Age. I'm ſure they repreſent it as the current Principle and Practice of the whole Chriſtian Church, in Apologies addreſs'd to the Heathen Emperors themſelves. And, if this be true, can you imagine the Chriſtians wou'd inroll themſelves in the Armies, and turn Actors of what they abhorr'd to be Spectators? As a further Proof of this matter, CELSUS, a Pagan Writer of the ſame Age, makes it one of his Charges againſt the Chriſtians, that they refus'd to bear Arms for the Emperor; which ORIGEN owns and juſtifies, (*contra Celſ.* l. viii. p. 426, 7.) So that, conſidering the paſſive Principles of that Age, I wou'd as ſoon believe my Lord MARLBOROUGH had a whole Regiment of Quakers in his Army, as that ANTONINUS had a whole Legion of Chriſtians in his.

AND there is little Reaſon to wonder at this Practice in that innocent and ſevere Age of Chriſtianity, if we conſider the groſs Idolatry and Superſtition of the *Roman* Armies, which 'twas impoſſible for the Soldiers to avoid complying with.

IN the firſt place, the military Oath, like all other Heathen ones, was flat Idolatry; and for this I refer you to *Tertul. de Corona*, c. 11. & *de Idol.* c. 19, 20, 21. In the next place, their Standards were all Gods, and had divine Honours paid them. The Soldiers ſwore by them, and preferr'd them to all their other Divinities, (*Tertul. Apol.* c. 16.) TACITUS ſtyles them *Bellorum Dii*, (*Hiſt.* iii. 10.) *Legionum Numina*, (*Ann.* ii. 17.) The ſame is confirm'd by LIVY, (xxvi. 48.) by LUCAN, (i. 347.) *Hiſt. Tripart.* (i. 5.) Nor was this all; for the Images of the Emperors were either fixt aloft upon the Standards, or plac'd in the midſt of them at the General's head Quarters in the Camp, to be ador'd by the Army, *Singuli venerantur*, (*Modeſtus de re militari.*) *Herodian.* viii. 15. *Tacit. Hiſt.* i. 41. *Ann.* iv. 2. *Veget.* ii. 6. *Suet.* in *Tiberio*, c. 48. in *Calig.* c. 14. And can you imagine that the Conſcience of a good Chriſtian wou'd give him leave to march under ſuch Idolatrous and Antichriſtian Banners, the *Vexilla æmula Chriſti*, as TERTULLIAN juſtly ſtyles them? *de Corona milit.* c. 11.

From

From what I have ſaid, it ſeems pretty plain, that the entrance into the Armies was guarded by ſo many Pagan Oaths and Teſts, that 'twas impoſſible for a Chriſtian to ſerve in them unleſs 'twere by the help of *Occaſional Conformity*. At leaſt, in ſuch a Caſe, you'll allow me, that the Prayers of ſuch mock Chriſtians wou'd hardly work Wonders: And for my part, if I believ'd the Miracle, I wou'd much rather impute it, with CLAUDIAN, to the Virtues of ANTONINUS.

——*Omne Tonantis*
Obſequium Marci mores potuere mereri.
(Ad. 6. Conſ. Hon.)

BUT the Argument, as I have urg'd it, is much ſtronger under a perſecuting Reign, as ANTONINUS's moſt certainly was. In the third, and beginning of the fourth Century, when the Severity of the Chriſtian Diſcipline began to ſlacken, and greater Liberties were allow'd, there is frequent mention made of Chriſtian Soldiers; but 'tis very remarkable, that in the Perſecutions which broke out after that time, the firſt Storm was ſure to fall on the Army.

Of this we have a ſignal Inſtance under SEVERUS, when a Soldier was puniſh'd for no other Crime but owning himſelf a Chriſtian, which was the Prelude and leading ſtep to the Perſecution which immediately follow'd, (*Tertul. de Corona*, c. 1.) The Soldiers likewiſe felt the firſt Fury of the Perſecution under DIOCLESIAN; all that refus'd to ſacrifice to the Heathen Gods being broke and turn'd out of the Army, (*Lactant. de mort. Perſ.* 9. *Euſeb. Chron.*) And the Perſecution of LICINIUS firſt began with the Soldiers; and alſo under JULIAN, (*Sulpic. Sever.* l. ii. c. 47.) So that if the Chriſtians, for Reaſons of State, which are very obvious, were not ſuffer'd to bear Arms under perſecuting Reigns, 'tis plain there cou'd be none in the Army of ANTONINUS, whoſe whole Reign was one continu'd Perſecution.

NOR is this Particular, of a whole Legion of Chriſtians, confirm'd by the other Chriſtian Writers that relate this Miracle. There is nothing like it in TERTULLIAN, OROSIUS, or the ALEXANDRIAN Chronicle; and the ſame is expreſly

preſly contradicted by PAUL DIACONUS, and the Author of the ſpurious Edict publiſh'd at the end of JUSTIN MARTYR's ſecond Apology. And don't you think the diſagreement of the Chriſtian Writers, in ſo remarkable a Circumſtance of the Story, a good Argument of the Falſhood of the whole?

TO ſum up the Argument in few Words, conſidering the numbers of the Chriſtians were not great in that Age; eſpecially in the Country Villages, where the Legions were rais'd; together with their paſſive Principles, the Teſtimony of CELSUS, and the groſs Idolatry of the *Roman* Armies, eſpecially in a perſecuting Reign; and the diſagreement of Chriſtian Writers on this head; it ſeems very probable that there were few or no Chriſtians, much leſs an entire Legion of them, in the Army. I ſhall now proceed to

ARTICLE II.

That the Thundering Legion *did not take its Name from this Miracle.*

EUSEBIUS affirms, that the *Melitenian* Legion, from this Event, was ſirnam'd the *Thundering Legion*. But who ever heard of this *Melitenian* Legion before or after? Was it ever mention'd by any Hiſtorian, Inſcription, or Medal? You may conſult SCALIGER and VALESIUS on this head, to whom I refer you. The laſt has very happily accounted for the riſe of this Miſtake in EUSEBIUS. Nor did the *Thundering Legion* take its Name from this Miracle, as APOLLINARIS pretends. 'Tis certain from the *Trieſte* Inſcription, cited by SCALIGER, (*ad Euſeb. Chron.* p. 223.) that the *Thundering Legion* was as old as the days of TRAJAN; and it appears from DIO CASSIUS, (*l.* 55. *p.* 568.) that there was a *Thundering Legion* as high as the Reign of AUGUSTUS: And from both theſe Teſtimonies, 'tis very plain that APOLLINARIS, the firſt

first Broacher of the Miracle, was grosly mistaken, to say no worse.

ARTICLE III.

That ANTONINUS *never ascrib'd this Miracle to the Prayers of the Christians.*

HAD this Miracle been publickly own'd by the Emperor, and ascrib'd to the Prayers of the Christians, 'tis incredible that all the Pagan Historians shou'd, with one consent, conspire to disown it in their Writings, as EUSEBIUS confesses they did. See *Dio Cass.* l. lxxi. p. 805. *Capitol. in Anton.* c. 24. the nameless Authors cited by SUIDAS in ἀρνῦφις. Nor wou'd THEMISTIUS, (*de regia virtute ad Theod.*) and CLAUDIAN (*in 6m Cons. Honor.*) have dar'd to ascribe the Honour of it to Heathen Gods, in Panegyricks inscrib'd to Christian Emperors.

THAT ANTONINUS thought himself oblig'd to his own Gods for this Miracle, we have a Testimony beyond Exception in his own Pillar, which is still extant at *Rome*;

Rome; of which I have ſeen a Cut in BARONIUS's Annals, to whom I refer you for your farther Satisfaction. The ſame is confirm'd by a Medal in the *French* King's Cabinet, publiſh'd by MORELLI; which was ſtruck the very Year this Miracle was ſaid to be wrought, (*viz.* 174.) On one ſide is the Head of ANTONINE, crown'd with Laurel; on the reverſe, a *Mercury*, with this Inſcription, *Religio Auguſti*, which exactly agrees with DIO's Account of the Miracle. What ſhall we ſay then? ſhall we charge ANTONINUS with Ignorance, in not knowing that the Merit of this Miracle was owing to the Chriſtians? But that's impoſſible; for he was preſent upon the Spot. Shall we ſuſpect his Candor and Sincerity? That wou'd ill ſuit with the Character of that excellent Prince, whom I eſteem one of the beſt and wiſeſt of mortal Men.

A R-

ARTICLE IV.

That ANTONINUS, *after this pretended Miracle, never publiſh'd any Edict in favour of the Chriſtians.*

IF ANTONINUS did not aſcribe this Miracle to the Chriſtians, 'tis plain he cou'd publiſh no Edict in their favour on that Account; and 'tis very remarkable, that none of the Writers who relate this Miracle pretend to have ſeen the Edict publiſh'd by ANTONINUS, in favour of the Chriſtians, after this Deliverance. SCALIGER thinks it may fairly be inferr'd from TERTULLIAN's Words, that he never ſaw it. As for OROSIUS and XIPHILIN, 'tis plain they never did; and the Epiſtle of ANTONINUS, publiſh'd at the end of JUSTIN MARTYR's ſecond Apology, has been prov'd ſo errant a Forgery by SCALIGER, (*ad Euſeb. Chron.* p. 223.) that it has been given up, with one conſent, by all the Advocates for the Miracle.

LAN-

LANGIUS (*ad Niceph.* iv. 12.) and PAMEL. (*ad Tertul. Apol.* 6.) pretend to find ſome Traces of this Edict in a Conſtitution of VERUS and ANTONINUS, cited by ULPIAN. The ſame is affirm'd by SYLBURGIUS, in his Notes on ANTONINE's Epiſtle, publiſh'd with JUSTIN MARTYR's Apologies.

BUT all this is a moſt miſerable Miſtake. In the firſt place, that Edict does not regard the Chriſtians. In the next place, 'twas impoſſible for VERUS, who dy'd *A.C.* 169, to publiſh an Edict, which bore relation to a Miracle that happen'd *A. C.* 174. But what is worſt of all, that Edict was not publiſh'd (as they pretend) by VERUS and ANTONINUS, but by SEVERUS and ANTONINUS CARACALLA his Son and Partner in the Empire, as you may ſee in *Digeſt. l.* 50. *tit.* 2. *Sect.* 3. p. 876. *Edit. Amſtelod.* But I have ſtill a far better Argument behind, to prove there was no ſuch Edict ever publiſh'd by ANTONINUS, and that is the bloody Perſecution of the Chriſtians, which broke out in *Gaul A. C.* 177. but three Years after the Date of the

the Miracle. 'Tis in vain for the Patrons of this Miracle to pretend that this Perſecution was rais'd by the Rage of popular Tumults, and the Cruelty of provincial Governors, in defiance of the imperial Edicts. All the World knows that ANTONINUS was obey'd at another rate. But to ſet this matter beyond all Diſpute, we have the poſitive Teſtimony of EUSEBIUS, (*Hiſt. Eccl.* v. 1.) that the Martyrs of *Gaul* ſuffer'd by the expreſs Command of the Emperor.

THAT there was a Perſecution of the Chriſtians by ANTONINUS, after this Miracle, appears from the Teſtimony of *Theoph. ad Autol.* in the very Concluſion of his Apology; which was written in the beginning of the Reign of COMMODUS, as may be eaſily inferr'd from ſome notes of Time in his third Book. He there mentions the Death of ANTONINUS, and ſays the Perſecution ſtill continu'd. The *Alexandrian* Chronology ſays, the Perſecution ended in the firſt Year of COMMODUS; and conſequently THEOPHILUS wrote his Apology that very Year, in the Interval between the

Acceſſion of COMMODUS to the Crown, and the ſtop which was put to the Perſecution.

FROM what I have ſaid, 'tis very plain that the Chriſtians were perſecuted by ANTONINUS after this Miracle: And this Argument alone appears to me to be an unanſwerable Demonſtration of the Folly and Falſhood of this imaginary Edict, and the whole Story it ſelf. I appeal to all Mankind, whether 'tis reaſonable to believe that the Emperor wou'd have commanded, or ſuffer'd ſuch Severities to have been acted againſt the Chriſtians, if their Prayers had ſo miraculouſly preſerv'd himſelf, his Army, and his Empire. Human Nature is not capable of ſuch Ingratitude, ſuch black and barbarous Uſage, much leſs the generous Diſpoſition of ANTONINUS. I might ſafely reſt the whole Cauſe on the ſingle Strength of this Article, but I ſhall proceed to

AR-

ARTICLE V.

That the Chriſtians in general did not believe this Miracle, notwithſtanding the Teſtimony of APOLLINARIS *and* TERTULLIAN.

FOR this no better Argument can be alledg'd, than the ſilence of all the Chriſtian Writers of the third Century; not one of whom, except TERTULLIAN, that I ever read or heard of, has made the leaſt mention of this Miracle. Is it poſſible that ſo ſignal a Teſtimony, in favour of Chriſtianity, cou'd eſcape the Knowledge and Induſtry of ſo many able Apologiſts, as wrote after TERTULLIAN? Cou'd they have fail'd to urge ſo ſtrong an Argument againſt the Heathens, as a Miracle ſo publickly vouch'd and atteſted, and own'd, as is pretended, by Imperial Edicts? No other rational Account can be given for their Silence, but that they gave no Credit to the Story, and were too wiſe to expoſe their Religion to the Scorn

of the Heathens, by imploying ſo mean an Artifice to ſupport it.

HAD this Miracle been generally believ'd in the fourth and beginning of the fifth Century, THEMISTIUS and CLAUDIAN, tho both Pagans, were too good Courtiers to aſſert the contrary in Panegyricks on Chriſtian Emperors; eſpecially CLAUDIAN, who, notwithſtanding his own Religion, made no ſcruple to compliment HONORIUS on a Chriſtian Miracle, to which the Heathens never laid claim, (*in* 3 *Conſul. Honor.*) EUSEBIUS, tho he has given a full relation of the Miracle in all its Circumſtances, yet it appears plainly, by the cloſe of his Narration, that he did not believe it, as VALESIUS rightly obſerves. So that the whole Credit of this Miracle reſts on the Authority of APOLLINARIS and TERTULLIAN. As for the firſt, I know little of his Character; his Works, I think, being all loſt. But 'tis remarkable, that the only Particular which is preſerv'd of his Relation is undoubtedly falſe. TERTULLIAN wanted neither Wit nor Learning, but he muſt be allow'd to be a very credulous

dulous Writer, and an errant Enthuſiaſt; of which I need produce no other Proof than his believing the Prophecies of the *Montaniſts*, who were near a-kin to our new Prophets.

ARTICLE VI.

That the Deliverance of the Roman *Army, tho undoubtedly true, was no Miracle.*

I SEE nothing ſupernatural in this Deliverance of the *Romans*. Thunder and Rain are no Miracles, and they are never the leſs natural for happening in ſo critical a Seaſon. There are Examples enow in the *Greek* and *Roman* Story of ſuch caſual Events, which, becauſe they were a little uncommon and ſurprizing, and fell out in ſeaſonable Junctures of time, have been ſtyl'd Miracles by the Ignorance and Superſtition of the vulgar. *Dionyſ. Halicarnaſſ.* l. vii. tells us, that 'twas by the help of ſuch a miraculous Storm that the *Tuſcan* Army was ruin'd by the *Cumæans*. 'Twas by ſuch another Miracle, that BRENNUS was driven from the Temple

of *Delphi*, (*Pauſanias* l. x. p. 652, 3. *Juſtin* xxiv. 8.) and HANNIBAL from the Walls of *Rome*, (*Liv.* xxvi. 11. *Sil. Ital.* l. xii.) The eſcape of the *Roman* Army in the Deſarts of *Africa*, under the Reign of CLAUDIUS, was every whit as extraordinary (*Dio Caſſ.* l. lx. p. 671.) And the Storm of Wind which gave THEODOSIUS the Victory over EUGENIUS, is cry'd up for a Miracle by all the Church Hiſtorians of the Age, and by CLAUDIAN, tho a Pagan, (*in* 3 *Conſ. Honor.*) Theſe Facts are all very well atteſted, and have as fair a Pretence to paſs for Miracles, as the preſent one we are now treating of; which I preſume is an Honour you will hardly allow them.

SINCE we are upon the Subject of Miracles, I can't help adding a few Remarks on this head, in confirmation of what I have advanc'd. When the Truth of our Religion had been confirm'd by ſo many ſignal Miracles, which were never diſown'd by the Heathens themſelves, it quickly triumph'd over all Oppoſition, and ſpread with a wonderful Progreſs over all Parts of the *Roman* Empire. When Chriſtianity

Chriſtianity had gain'd ſuch footing in the World, the Work was half done, and the reſt might be ſafely truſted to the Preaching of our Miniſters and the Sufferings of our Martyrs: and the ends of Miracles being fully accompliſh'd, 'twas high time for Miracles themſelves to ceaſe; for God Almighty never waſtes them in vain. This Notion I take to be very agreeable to the general Senſe of the Proteſtant Divines, and for this Reaſon I give little Credit to any Miracles ſince the Days of the Apoſtles. I am loth, I confeſs, to reject all, without reſerve, for the ſake of a very remarkable one which happen'd at the rebuilding the Temple of *Jeruſalem*, under JULIAN; which is ſo extraordinary in all its Circumſtances, and ſo fully atteſted by all the Chriſtian and Heathen Hiſtorians of that Age, that I don't ſee with what forehead any Man can queſtion the Truth of it. Nor does this diſagree with my Notion of Miracles; for perhaps from the very firſt riſe of Chriſtianity there never was greater need of a Miracle than at that juncture, when the World was relapſing apace into Idolatry: And peradventure God Almighty, in his infinite Wiſdom,

thought it neceſſary to interpoſe in ſo miraculous a manner, to prevent the re-eſtabliſhment of the *Jewiſh* Nation, that they might ſtill continue Exiles and Fugitives, ſcorn'd and abhorr'd by all Mankind, and remain a laſting Monument of Divine Vengeance.

I EASILY foreſee one Objection you will make to all I have ſaid on this Subject. If this Miracle be a Lye, how came it to be firſt invented and believ'd? How ill does ſuch a Forgery ſuit with the Character of the Primitive Church, ſo juſtly fam'd for Candour and Simplicity, and all other moral Virtues?

TO this I'll give you an Anſwer, when you'll pleaſe to account for all the other Forgeries of thoſe Ages; for the Story of AGBARUS, and SIMON MAGUS, for CONSTANTINE's ✕ in the Air, the *Sybilline* Oracles, the forg'd Teſtimony of JOSEPHUS, and an infinite number of falſe Goſpels and Epiſtles father'd on the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts. All I ſhall anſwer at preſent is, that tho the Primitive Chriſtians in general liv'd up to the full Rules

Rules of their Religion, with the utmoſt Probity and Innocence of Manners, yet 'tis too certain that there were ſome Perſons among them, who, thro a miſtaken Zeal, made no ſcruple of lying for the Honour of their Religion. Their Fictions found an eaſy Reception in a credulous Age, and were convey'd down to Poſterity, as certain and undoubted Truths.

I HAVE now finiſh'd my Diſcourſe; and, if after all the Pains I have taken, you ſtill reſolve to believe the Miracle of the *Thundering Legion*, I wiſh you no greater Penance, than that you may believe the Martyrdom of the *Thebæan*.

W. M.

Mr. K——'s *Anſwer.*

SIR,

I HAVE attentively perus'd your moſt accurate Diſquiſition of the Story of the Thundering Legion, *and it gives me this particular Satisfaction, that now I know the utmoſt Efforts the Wit of Man can make to invalidate the Truth of it. You have ſo critically examin'd every Circumſtance of the Relation by* EUSEBIUS, *and gone ſo nigh to prove it falſe, that if I am convinc'd by your Arguments, and muſt yield my aſſent to what you ſay, I ſhall, however, have this for my comfort, that I han't been led by a blind Submiſſion, but by the inducement of ſpecious Reaſons. But before I wholly acquieſce, I hope you will pardon me, if I examine, with a friendly Freedom, every Article of your Diſcourſe, that you may obtain the more honourable Victory, if I am overcome, and I may have an opportunity of quitting my Belief of the Story with a more decent Surrender.*

TO begin then, and go on, (as you have done) with an Induction of Particulars, the ſureſt way to trace out the footſteps of Truth, I ſhall examine your Diſcourſe on

ARTICLE I.

That there was not an entire Legion of Chriſtians in the Army of ANTONINUS.

THO I agree with you in general that 'tis improbable there was an entire Legion of Chriſtians in ANTONINE's *Army, it being a thing equally difficult to believe, whether we conſider it as the Effect of Chance or Deſign; yet I can by no means allow your Argument from the paucity of Chriſtians in that Age, as that they were not ſo numerous as to furniſh the Army with whole Legions: For, if they were ſo numerous in the Reigns immediately before and after* ANTONINE, *as to over-run both Cities and Countries, and to endanger them with diſpeopling if deſtroy'd, 'tis unreaſonable*

to

to conclude that they were ſo few in number, in his Reign, as not to be ſufficient to complete whole Legions; eſpecially after the Encouragements that were given for Converſion to Chriſtianity by the Reſcripts and Edicts which were publiſh'd in their favour by the preceding Emperors to ANTONINUS. Plin. Epiſt. *l.* x. *ep.* 97, 98. Euſeb. Eccl. Hiſt. *l.* iv. *c.* 9, 13. *l.* vi. *c.* 43. Tertull. Apol. *as you quote him, and* ad Scap. iv. *But* TERTULLIAN's *Authority you won't allow of; and why? Is it becauſe he ſo plainly and poſitively aſſerts the vaſt multitude of Chriſtians which fill'd all Places; and that publickly, to the face of the* Roman *Governors, who cou'd not be ignorant of the Truth of what he ſaid? nor durſt he, before them, to affirm what was not true: If he had, it wou'd rather have increas'd their Spleen, than mitigated their Anger. But this ſurely is not agreeable to your Candor, to deny a plain matter of fact, ſo fairly and openly atteſted. No, a great Man, I find, has overborn your Opinion of* TERTULLIAN, *by the weight of his Words, who ſays,* " *The numbers he* " *ſpeaks of, is only a ſlight of his* African " *Eloquence; for the Chriſtians about*

" *forty*

" *forty Years after this did not exceed*
" *the fortieth Part of the Inhabitants of*
" Rome, *the head Quarters of Chriſtia-*
" *nity.*" *But I think the* African *is ſuf-ficiently juſtify'd by* PLINY's *Evidence* (*as above*) *when Chriſtianity was in its In-fancy, and Chriſtians conſequently fewer*; *and is alſo ſtrengthen'd by thoſe Words in* LUCIAN's Pſeudomantis, *viz.* Ἀθέων ἐμπε-πλῆσθαι ἁπάντων τὸν Πόντον, p. 762. *and by the Authors who write of the* Decian *and* Diocleſian *Perſecutions, when almoſt whole Cities and Countries were deſtroy'd. And laſtly, by ſeveral of the Chriſtian Apo-logiſts. The way the Biſhop has taken to eſtimate the number of Chriſtians in* Rome, *ſeems very precarious. It is found-ed upon a Reſolution to juſtify his Hypo-theſis of the original of the* Catacombs, *that they were an Heathen and not a Chriſtian Work*; *and accordingly the num-ber of the latter muſt be leſſen'd as much as poſſible, to make them incapable of ſuch an Undertaking*; *and* CORNELIUS *as well as* TERTULLIAN's *Account of the vaſt numbers of Chriſtians in* Rome *and* Carthage, *muſt be eſteem'd only as ſtrains of Eloquence to ſerve a Party: which*

which is a Reflection very unbecoming one who has no poſitive Proof to back what he himſelf aſſerts, but a mere Conjecture of his own; and unworthily made upon two ſuch great Members of the Primitive Church, whereof one was a Martyr, and the other (at that time) a ſtrenuous Defender of the Faith. Biſhop PEARSON's *Judgment of* TERTULLIAN, *I hope, will paſs with you; at leaſt when it comes recommended by theſe Words of Biſhop* BURNET: "*That his Diſcourſe* "*on the Creed is the moſt perfect Work* "*we have. His Learning was the moſt* "*profound and exact, and he was equally* "*happy both in the force of his Argu-* "*ment and the plainneſs of his Expreſ-* "*ſions.*" *On the* thirty nine Articles, Pref. p. 5. *This truly great Man ſays, That* TERTULLIAN *was a Perſon of Credit, being* adeò gravis, adeò antiquus autor, & rerum Romanarum peritiſſimus, *Opera Poſthuma*, p. 63, &c. *After all, it is very ſtrange that* Rome, *the head Quarters of Chriſtianity, ſhou'd have ſo ſmall a number of Chriſtians, in proportion to the other Inhabitants there; whereas* Carthage, *and the Countries of* Bythinia, Pontus

Pontus, Cappadocia, *and* Syria, *with ſeveral other Parts of* Aſia, *were almoſt peopled with Chriſtians. But if the Biſhop be right in his Aſſertion, then the head Quarters of Chriſtianity muſt be ſomewhere elſe than at* Rome, *as I incline to believe; and that they were either at* Antioch, *where the name of Chriſtians firſt began, or rather at* Epheſus, *where the laſt of the Apoſtles dy'd, and which was the Place of his Reſidence ſome time before; aud to which he gives the Preheminence, when he wrote to the ſeven Churches in* Aſia. *To confirm me in this Opinion,* Ulpian de Offic. Procon. *c.* 4. *has this Paſſage,* Præſides aut Proconſules in Aſiam miſſos, debuiſſe Epheſum appellere: *To which* BALDWIN *the Lawyer adds this Remark,* Maxima tum erat Epheſi Eccleſia Chriſtianorum; *which time is very nigh ſeventy Years after the Death of* ANTONINUS, *when the Biſhip's Calculation is fix'd. Moreover, it was either here, or in the neighbouring Cities, and Countries adjacent, that the moſt ſevere Perſecutions began; and where all the Proconſuls, who procur'd Reſcripts from the ſeveral Emperors* TRAJAN,

JAN, ADRIAN, *and* ANTONINUS PIUS, *had their Reſidence. It was to the Chriſtians of thoſe Countries alſo, that St.* PETER's *Epiſtles, and two of St.* PAUL's, *were chiefly inſcrib'd, and where they ſpent a great part of their Labours. So that all this put together, makes me conclude that the head Quarters of Chriſtianity were more probably at* Epheſus *than at* Rome; *and that, tho* Italy *and its Villages cou'd not ſupply the Army with whole Legions, yet* Aſia *and its Towns cou'd. And I can't acquieſce in what you urge, that their number was far leſs in proportion in the Country than in the Cities; for* PLINY *makes no difference, but uſes the ſame Word to ſhow that Chriſtianity over-run both Country Villages and Cities. And tho* Paganiſm, *as you ſay, prevail'd in the Country, from whence it took its Name, yet I can't aſſent to you, that this was after it was quite loſt in the Cities; for* Rome *and* Athens *were the two laſt Places belonging to the* Roman *Empire, where ſome Gentiles were to be found.*

IT can't be deny'd that the Primitive Chriſtians abhorr'd Murder and Bloodſhed, of what kind ſoever; and 'tis very probable, from their paſſive Principles, that they were not very fond of going into the Army. Yet I am not altogether convinc'd that they held it wholly unlawful to ſerve their Princes in the Wars. For, in the New Teſtament, where mention is made of Soldiers, as it is in more Places than one, their Profeſſion is never condemn'd as unlawful, but Doctrines are preach'd to them, and Rules given them to walk by, as continuing in the State of Warfare. ORIGEN, *I confeſs, does not deny* CELSUS's *Charge on them: tho, indeed, I think it no Charge, but a bare Admonition to incite them ſtrenuouſly to aſſiſt the Emperor in his juſt Wars; which only ſuppoſes them backward in doing it, not that they wou'd refuſe wholly to go to war. Whatever* ORIGEN *ſays in this place, in anſwer to* CELSUS, *he ſeems to allow of a lawful War*, lib. iv. p. 217. *But what if he did not? muſt this be the general Opinion of the Chriſtians of that Age? 'Tis plain it was not, even by*

your

your own Words: For you say, "In the "third and (beginning of the) fourth Cen- "tury, when the Severity of the Christian "Discipline began to slacken, —there is "frequent mention made of Christian Sol- "diers." The Book you quote for this is Tertull. de Coron. *which was written in the very beginning of the third Century, before the Severity of the Christian Discipline was slacken'd, and not much above thirty Years after the Affair in debate was transacted. So that 'tis not much more improbable that there shou'd be Christian Soldiers in* ANTONINUS'*s Army than in* SEVERUS'*s: nay, 'tis not impossible that some of the very same Men shou'd be in both Armies. There are other Authorities both of private Persons, and of the Church it self, to prove that War was allow'd of in that Age.* CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS *describing the Habit of a Christian, says,* Decere eum intectis pedibus (esse) nisi forte militet. *And* BASIL, *speaking of the Primitive Christians, has these Words:* τοὺς ἐν πολέμοις φόνους οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐν τοῖς φόνοις οὐκ ἐλογίσαντο ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν, συγγνώμην δόντες ὑπὲρ σωφροσύνης καὶ εὐσεβείας ἀμυνομένοις. *That the Church allow'd it, is presum'd, because*

never any Soldiers were deny'd Baptiſm, nor excommunicated: nay, the Clementine Conſtitution, *lib.* viii. *c.* 32. *directs how a Soldier is to be inſtructed at his Baptiſm. See* Grot. de jure Belli, *l.* i. *c.* 2.

AND this leads me to conſider your next Argument, taken from the Idolatry of the Roman *Armies, to prove that few or no Chriſtians were in that of* ANTONINUS. *You ſay, that the entrance into the Armies was guarded with idolatrous Oaths, and their Standards were all Gods, and had Divine Honours paid them: ſo that it was impoſſible for a Chriſtian to ſerve in them,* &c. *This Objection is wholly new to me: not one Author that I have ſeen on that Subject has taken notice of it. And I muſt own it did at firſt ſhock my Belief of the Story: but on ſecond thoughts I muſt crave leave to diſſent from you, not being ſatisfy'd with that Argument as logical and concluſive; for you argue againſt matter of fact by a bare Suppoſition. You go to prove that Chriſtians were not in the Army, becauſe they muſt be guilty of Idolatry if they were: whereas you ought to reaſon from*

matters of fact. If Chriſtians were in the Army, then they were not guilty of Idolatry. And that Chriſtian Soldiers were in the Army within a few Years after ANTONINUS's *Time, you your ſelf acknowledge: And that they were not guilty of Idolatry, you give a good Reaſon to conclude from your own Remark, That in the Perſecutions which broke out after that time, the firſt Storm was ſure to fall on the Army. And a little farther you obſerve, the Soldiers felt the firſt Fury of the Perſecution under* DIOCLESIAN; *all that refus'd to ſacrifice to the Heathen Gods, &c. Now by what you ſay, 'tis plain they were in the Army ſome while before they were perſecuted. And 'tis as plain they were perſecuted for not being Idolaters. I will add, 'tis as plain the Church never thought them ſo, becauſe they were never excommunicated, nor reckon'd among the* Lapſi, *nor deny'd Abſolution, that we read of. So that it was not impoſſible for a Chriſtian to be a Soldier, without mercenary temporizing, even in a time when Chriſtian Diſcipline began to ſlacken, as you ſuppoſe: tho that, I think, does not appear till*

till the Emperors turn'd Chriſtian, and the Biſhops became Courtiers.

BUT are you ſure, after all, that the Soldier's Oath was entirely Pagan at that time? Were they not permitted to ſwear by the Safety of the Emperor, as TERTULLIAN in Apolog. *c.* 3. *or by his Majeſty, as* VEGETIUS *ſays? And might they not be as free from Idolatry in the Camp as in the Palace, which was fill'd with* Lares, *and ſtuff'd with Heatheniſh Superſtition? And yet many Chriſtians were therein, even in* NERO's *time, as St.* PAUL *teſtifies,* in Epiſt. ad Philip. *Among whom was* EPAPHRODITUS, *his fellow Priſoner, a very conſiderable Perſon in that Court, as well as in* DOMITIAN's, *under whom he ſuffer'd Martyrdom. He was, in all probability, the Maſter of* EPICTETUS, *and the Patron of* JOSEPHUS, *to whom he dedicates his Antiquities*; (*which, by the by, gives me ſome reaſon to believe the Paſſage concerning Chriſt not ſpurious.*) *But to clear up this point, I have an Inſtance* (*tho not in* ANTONINUS's *Army, yet in* TIBERIUS's) *which is full,*

and to the purpoſe. It is CORNELIUS, *a Centurion of the* Italian *Band; which doubtleſs was a* Roman *and Pagan Legion.* Acts x. 1. Hunc gentilem fuiſſe liquet, nec Italum fuiſſe, etiam ac Romanum, dubitant viri docti. SELDEN *on the place,* Militiam autem abdicâſſe, aut ad eam abdicandam a Petro monitus non legitur. GROTIUS, de jure Belli, *l.* i. *c.* 2. *§* 9. *So that now I hope you will allow that a true Primitive Chriſtian might be a Soldier, without the help of* Occaſional Conformity.

YOUR laſt Section on the firſt Article, concludes with this Obſervation, That this particular of a whole Legion of Chriſtians is not confirm'd by the other Chriſtian Writers of this Miracle; and that their diſagreement, &c. *is a good Argument for the falſhood of the whole. I don't find that any Author but* XIPHILIN *abſolutely affirms the Soldiers of the* Melitenian *Legion to be all Chriſtians. The Words in* EUSEBIUS's *Hiſtory may be fairly interpreted, that ſome only of the Legion were Chriſtians, and that on behalf of their Act, the whole might*

might be mention'd. EUSEBIUS, *in his* Chronicon, *ſeems to countenance this, ſaying only the Army was ſav'd by the Prayers of the Chriſtians. But I think it not at all concluſive againſt the Truth of the Story, if the Authors don't exactly agree. There are ſeveral Inſtances of this kind in the* Roman, *as well as other Hiſtories, where things are related different ways by ſeveral Authors, and yet the main true.*

ARTICLE II.

That the Thundering Legion did not take its Name from this Miracle.

THAT there was a Legion of that Name before this Miracle, I am fully ſatisfy'd from the Authors you quote; and that there were more than one I am convinc'd not only from Goltzii Numiſmata, *where ſeveral are mention'd, but from the* Notitia Imperii, *where that in particular at* Melitene *is ſpoken of; which intimates that there was another twelfth Legion at ſome other place; For what*

elſe is that note of Diſtinction? Now, that this is the very ſame Legion which EUSEBIUS *ſpeaks of, I am perſuaded by what* DIO *ſays, viz. That there was a* Thundering Legion *quarter'd in* Cappadocia *about his time, and by its being fix'd at* Melitene (*a Town of that Country*) *by the* Notitia. *And this will eaſily account for the Miſtakes* (*if they be ſo*) *both of* EUSEBIUS *and* APOLLINARIS. *For ſince there was a* Thundering Legion *quarter'd at* Melitene, *and that a* Thundering Legion *which ſo miraculouſly obtain'd the Victory over the* Quadi, *one might very eaſily conjecture that before the Action it was call'd the* Melitenian, *and that from the Action it was nam'd the* Thundering Legion. *And that alſo will juſtify what I before ſuppos'd, that the head Quarters of Chriſtianity were at* Epheſus *and the Country adjacent; where inhabited vaſt numbers of Chriſtians, ſufficient to ſupply the Armies with Legions. And I'm the more confirm'd in this Opinion, when I conſider that nigh all the Apologiſts,* JUSTIN MARTYR, MELITO, APOLLONIUS, *&c. who addreſs'd themſelves to* ANTONINUS, *were*

were Aſiaticks *when they wrote their Apologies.*

ARTICLE III.

That ANTONINUS never aſcrib'd this Miracle to the Prayers of the Chriſtians.

I MUST crave leave to diſagree with you, that 'tis incredible that all the Pagan Hiſtorians ſhou'd, with one conſent, conſpire to diſown the Emperor's aſcribing the Miracle to the Prayers of the Chriſtians. They cou'd not do otherwiſe whilſt they remain'd Heathens. Had they own'd the matter of fact, they muſt have been convinc'd and converted to Chriſtianity, as TERTULLIAN, CYPRIAN, *and others were, who had been originally Heathens. But it was moſt agreeable to the Spirit of Malignity that poſſeſs'd the Gentiles againſt the Chriſtians, not to ſuffer them to have any ſhare of the Honour of the Action, but rather aſcribe it to the Power of a Conjurer, tho ſo contrary to the Emperor's own Principle of diſregarding Wizards;*

or to the Piety of ANTONINUS, *and the Providence of their Gods, as (in all probability) the Senate did; as appears by the Story cut in the Pillar erected in honour of* ANTONINUS, *and by the Medal they caus'd to be ſtruck, in the Year the Miracle was wrought, without the leaſt notice taken in either of the Chriſtians Prayers. Tho, I am perſuaded, the Emperor ſent them a true Account of the matter of fact, not only by what* TERTULLIAN *ſays, but alſo by* DIO's *Words,* τῇ γραφῇ ἐπέστειλεν, p. 806. ad finem: *yet they thought not fit to preſerve any publick Record whatever of it, leſt it ſhou'd be too great a Confirmation of the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion, and too great a Blow to the Pagan. Their bitter Prejudice againſt the Chriſtians was doubtleſs the occaſion that neither this, nor any other publick Teſtimony for Chriſtianity, was preſerv'd. Nay, they were ſo far from acknowledging the leaſt Benefit obtain'd, by means of the Chriſtians, to the Commonwealth, that they imputed all the Evils which happen'd to them, and all the good things, procur'd by their Prayers, to* JUPITER, *as* TERTULLIAN *ſays,*

ſays, Invidia cœlum tundimus, & cum miſericordiam extorſerimus, Jupiter honoratur, *Apol. c.* 40. *of which, even this Story, as repreſented in the Pillar, is a flagrant Inſtance.* MARCUS, *I grant, was one of the beſt and greateſt of Men in the Heathen World; yet it can't be deny'd but that he was a perfect Bigot in his way, which made him ſo obdurate againſt the many excellent Apologies preſented him in behalf of the poor Chriſtians, that he perſecuted them with a relentleſs Severity, notwithſtanding his celebrated Clemency. And I am apt to think, that altho he wrote to the Senate in favour of the Chriſtians, yet his Pagan Zeal was ſo great, that he was ſolicitous for the Honour of his God* JUPITER, *that he ſhou'd have a ſhare in the Glory of the Miracle, and that the World ſhou'd believe it ſo.*

A R-

ARTICLE IV.

That ANTONINUS never publiſh'd, after this Miracle, any Edict in favour of the Chriſtians.

I ENTIRELY acquieſce in what you ſay againſt LANGIUS *and* PAMELIUS, *whoſe Opinion about the Edict, cited by* ULPIAN, *you have moſt effectually confuted: but I can't allow your next Argument to be ſo ſtrong, as you imagine, to prove that Reſcript of the Emperor's ſpurious. You urge for this, the bloody Perſecution which broke out in* Gaul, Anno 177, *three Years after the Date of this Miracle. But I muſt crave leave to ſay, that the fact, as to the time, is not ſufficiently prov'd. For this I muſt produce the Authorities of the Biſhop of* Worceſter, *and Mr.* DODWELL, *who are of opinion that the Perſecution happen'd ten Years before*, Anno 167. *The Biſhop, in a Letter to* FR. PAGI, *on his* Critic. ad Baronium, ad Ann. 177. *obſerves that* EUSEBIUS *has made two different Dates of the Perſecution. In his* Chron. *he has*

has ſet it 167, *and in his* Hiſtory 177. *The Reaſon of this Alteration was, that he might make it ſuit with the Age of Pope* ELEUTHERUS, *who, according to him, was not Pope till the Year* 177: *Wherein, ſays the Biſhop,* EUSEBIUS *was miſtaken; for* ELEUTHERUS *was Pope in* 167, *and conſequently the firſt Date of the Perſecution was right. According to Mr.* DODWELL, *it might happen in* 177; *becauſe* 167 *was the Year wherein the* Druſian *Games* (*which were quadriennial*) *were ſolemniz'd at* Lyons, *which they were not in* 177: *And yet the Confeſſors, in their Letter, ſay it happen'd during that Solemnity. Now to prove this Aſſertion, he ſays, that the time calculated from the firſt Inſtitution of thoſe Games,* A.U.C. 744, *to* A.U.C. 920, *which is* A.C. 167, *exactly agrees with this Year, in which they were celebrated, and conſequently were not celebrated in* Anno 177. *So that from what thoſe two great Men ſay, we may conclude that the Argument from the Perſecution does not leſſen the certainty of the Miracle.*

THE

THE Alexandrian Chronicon *I have not ſeen; but the Paſſage in* Theophilus Antiochenus *I have: And it does not by that appear that* ANTONINUS'S *Perſecution continu'd, but 'tis probable that the Gentiles, upon the Death of that Emperor, began afreſh to fall on the Chriſtians, the Authority of his Edict ceaſing with him, as they ſuppoſed; which, however, did not, as they were convinc'd within a little time after, by the Puniſhment of one, who had accus'd* APOLLONIUS, *a Senator, of being a Chriſtian,* Euſeb. *l.* v. *c.*2. *which is both a notable Proof of the Reality, and a remarkable Inſtance of the Sanction of that Edict.*

AS to your Appeal againſt the Unreaſonableneſs of believing that ANTONINUS *cou'd be capable of treating the Chriſtians ſeverely, after they had miraculouſly ſav'd him by their Prayers. I have this to anſwer, that his uſage of them before the Miracle, was almoſt as unaccountable and barbarous, as this wou'd have been after, ſuppoſing it to be done. For can any Man of Impartiality and*

Candor

Candor, imagine that a Perſon of ſuch profound Knowledge, Goodneſs and Humanity, as the Writers of MARCUS's *Life repreſent him, and his own Works ſhew him to be, cou'd ſo inhumanly butcher ſo many innocent Chriſtians, who never ſo much as diſobey'd or rebell'd againſt him, by any account that appears to the World; and that too after his three Predeceſſors had moſt graciouſly protected them by their Reſcripts and Edicts? If you have any other Apology to make for him than his vehement Zeal for his own Superſtition, (for I can call it no other) I wou'd fain know it: And if you have not, you may as well vindicate the* Sicilian *Veſpers, or the* Pariſian *Maſſacre.*

ARTICLE V.

That the Chriſtians in general did not believe this Miracle, notwithſtanding the Teſtimony of APOLLINARIS and TERTULLIAN.

THE Silence of the Chriſtian Writers of the third Century is not an undeniable Argument that they disbeliev'd the Miracle; for tho their Books which are now extant mention nothing of it, yet thoſe that are loſt might. That it was related by other Authors than are now in being, is plain from EUSEBIUS, *who ſays, that not only the Gentile Writers of the Age when the Fact was done, but the Chriſtians alſo writ of it: and that, he adds, with Simplicity and Integrity; amongſt whom was* APOLLINARIS. *Beſides, the relation of the Fact by* XIPHILIN, OROSIUS, *and* GREGORY NYSSEN, *are certainly taken out of other Authors than are now extant. So that I dare ſay there was not ſo great a Silence as you ſuppoſe, at the time when all the*

the Works of the Primitive Writers were to be found.

THE two Heathens, THEMISTIUS *and* CLAUDIAN, *tho they were good Courtiers, yet were too zealous for the Honour of their own Religion to yield the Glory of the Miracle to a Parcel of poor deſpis'd Chriſtians, when they had ſo fit an Opportunity of complimenting their Princes, in their Panegyricks, with a parallel of their Virtues in* ANTONINUS; *that Emperor being the Standard of Virtue to all ſucceeding Ages of the Empire. I can't think that* EUSEBIUS, *who (you own) has given a full Relation of the Miracle in all its Circumſtances, cou'd be ſo diſingenuous as to palm upon the World a Story that he did not believe himſelf, as you ſay* VALESIUS *rightly obſerves; and yet an Advocate for the Miracle, whilſt undermining the Foundation of it; which truly is not ſo ingenuous. How much more handſome wou'd it have been for that great Critick, like you, freely to have declar'd his real Sentiments of the Story, than to ſmother them in ſuch Expreſ-*

sions as give umbrage to suspect his Belief of it? 'Tis a Proof to me (whatever that great Man says) that EUSEBIUS *did believe the Miracle, both because he acknowledges that the Christian Writers, being Lovers of Truth, related the Fact after a plain and honest manner; and that the Rescript of the Emperor took effect in the Punishment of* APOLLONIUS's *Accuser, (as mention'd above) which Martyr's Trial and Apology he had then in his Custody.* APOLLINARIS *does not deserve so severe a Censure as you pass on him, if you credit* EUSEBIUS *in the Passage just now quoted, and another* lib. iv. c. 26. *where he joins him with* MELITO, *Bishop of* Sardis, *in this short Character,* διαπρεπῶς ἠκμάζεν. *And* PHOTIUS *says, he was much to be esteem'd on the account of his Doctrine and Style. That* TERTULLIAN *was an Enthusiast in the latter part of his Life, I don't deny; but that he was not sound and orthodox in his Faith, and of good Credit and Reputation when he wrote his Apology, you are the first Person I have met with who insinuates. He was as much run down by* TAN. FABER *for*

TIBERIUS's *Meſſage to the Senate concerning Chriſt,* (*a Paſſage juſt before this we are upon.*) *But the ſagacious* PEARSON *has abundantly confuted and expos'd the crowing Critick, as altogether ignorant of what* TIBERIUS, *the Senate, and* TERTULLIAN *meant.*

ARTICLE VI.

That the Deliverance of the *Roman* Army, tho undoubtedly true, is no Miracle.

THAT Thunder and Rain are no Miracles, I grant; nay, tho they ſometimes happen in a critical Seaſon: But that they are never miraculous, and that there was nothing wonderful in the Deliverance, I can't believe. If it be undoubtedly true that they were deliver'd, the great Pains the Heathens took to carry off the Honour of this miraculous Event, proves thus much at leaſt, That we have no reaſon to queſtion the matter of fact as extraordinary. How comes it elſe that they have ſo induſtriouſly endeavour'd to hand down to Poſterity, by

ſeveral kinds of Monuments, ſuch notorious Accounts of it, as we meet with in Books, Pillars, Pictures, aud Medals? Wou'd all ſorts of Authors, Hiſtorians, Orators and Poets, think you, conſent to impoſe upon the World a Story as miraculous, when there was nothing wondrous in it? Wou'd Prince and Senate, do you believe, unite in the Impoſition? Or can you imagiue that both Chriſtians and Pagans wou'd agree in the Forgery, and only conteſt for the Prerogative of the Miracle? You may relate other Stories very ſtrange and ſurprizing to countervail this, which might not indeed be reckon'd miraculous by the Wiſe, and only ſtyl'd ſo by the Ignorance and Superſtition of the Vulgar; but give me leave to ſay that this Event is eſteem'd by the Learned alone miraculous. And I know of no Man before your ſelf, but Mr. LARROQUE, *who has wholly diſbelievd the wondrous Part, and barely own'd the Victory. I wou'd not have you think that 'tis the Vulgar alone judge ſuch Effects as theſe miraculous; for 'tis apparent, as Archbiſhop* TILLOTSON *obſerves, in his Sermon on* Eccleſiaſtes ix. 11.

that even the Heathen did always acknowledge a ſpecial Interpoſition of *Fortune*, by which the Wiſer among them did underſtand the *Divine Providence*: *to confirm which, he quotes* PLUTARCH, LIVY, *and* CÆSAR, *who, tho* perhaps the moſt skilful and proſperous Warrier that ever was, makes *this* acknowledgment, *That*, as in all other things, ſo particularly in War, *Fortune* hath a huge Sway, *Folio Sermon* xxxvi. p. 436. *There are many Particulars in the Stories of* CYRUS, ALEXANDER, *and the* Romans, *which are very unaccountable, tho ſcarce taken notice of by ſuch as are not converſant with the Scriptures, where they are often diſcover'd to be the wonderful Iſſues of Providence. What do you think of that Expreſſion in* Judges, *of the* Stars fighting in their Courſes againſt SISERA? *'Don't you underſtand by it a remarkable Defeat of that General, by a viſible Hand from Heaven, in cauſing mighty and ſudden Rains to fall; which the common Opinion did aſcribe to a ſpecial Influence of the Planets, by means of which the River* Kiſhon *was ſwoll'n to that degree as to ſweep away*

a great part of SISERA's *Army? This is ſuch a parallel with the Fact we are upon, that I cannot but believe that the ſame Heavenly Bodies which influenc'd the Victory of* DEBORAH *and* BARAK *over the* Canaanites, *did alſo contribute in a wonderful manner to the overthrow of the* Quadi *by* ANTONINUS: *the ſame Almighty Providence over-ruling the Inſtruments of both theſe famous Actions. I cou'd wiſh the latter of thoſe, as ſeverally related by Chriſtian and Pagan Authors, was drawn up in two Columns; then wou'd you ſee how they all agree in the Miraculouſneſs of the Fact, tho they diſagree in the Circumſtances.*

I WAS mightily pleas'd with your Diſcourſe in your next Section, about the Confirmation of the Truth of our Religion by Miracles, till you went ſo far as to determine when 'twas high time for them to ceaſe, and when they were waſted in vain; and that you ſhou'd ſay, you gave little Credit to any Miracles ſince the Days of the Apoſtles. As for the Times and Seaſons of God Almighty's acting in an extraordinary manner, he has

put them wholly under the ſecret Counſel of his own unſearchable Will, and left nothing for us to determine; and he knows beſt the proper Time of working a Miracle: And when he thinks fit to give ſuch a Demonſtration of his Power, we ought to conclude it was done for a very good Reaſon, tho we may not be able to diſcover what it was. As for his waſting Miracles in vain, *I muſt uſe the liberty to tell you, it is a Term infinitely diſagreeing with the Notion we ought to have of the inexhauſtible Store and Plenitude of the Divine Power: Beſides, the allowing of one Miracle in an Age, can't be reckon'd a waſting in vain. Nor wou'd it be more unreaſonable to acknowledge this Miracle in the Life of* ANTONINUS, *than to approve of that which was done in* JULIAN's *Reign, except it be for the ſake of an Emperor's Teſtimony, which you won't allow this to have, tho I think this has as many concurrent Witneſſes, both of Gentiles and Chriſtians, as the other. Nor was the juncture much leſs ſeaſonable; for at that time the Example of* ANTONINUS's *perſonal Virtues, and his Care to encourage and promote*

mote the virtuous and learned Heathens, and to diſcountenance the Chriſtians, were not much inferior to JULIAN's *Wiles in undermining Chriſtianity. The Reaſon which you give for this Miracle is very good, tho not the chief and immediate; which was this: Our Saviour having foretold that* not one Stone of the Temple ſhou'd be left upon another, JULIAN, *according to the propenſe Malice he burn'd with againſt Chriſt, was reſolv'd, if poſſible, to defeat the Prediction, and prove him a falſe Prophet: whereupon he did both incite and aſſiſt the* Jews (*tho bitter Enemies*) *to rebuild the Temple at* Jeruſalem. *But the Providence of God, which turns the Counſels of the Wiſe into Fooliſhneſs, and which never fails, in its good time, to deſtroy all Machinations of Men againſt the Truth, (as* HOBBS *himſelf confeſſes) did counterplot the Projects of this cunning Politician, and made him the very Inſtrument of eſtabliſhing the Truth of that Prophecy which he endeavour'd by his Projects to overturn. This puts me in mind of a remarkable Story I lately read in St.* CHRYSOSTOM, contra Gentiles,

which

which happen'd alſo in JULIAN's *Reign. It is the burning of the Temple of* APOLLO *at* Daphne, *by Fire from Heaven, which is not only mention'd by Chriſtian Writers, but by* JULIAN *in* Miſopog. *and by* LIBANIUS *the Sophiſt, who made an Oration to the People of* Antioch, *on purpoſe to lament the loſs of it. This Fact, as related both by* LIBANIUS *and* CHRYSOSTOM, *has very particular Circumſtances to confirm its Reality. 'Twas done nigh the ſame time with the other, reported by Perſons of different Religions, and perform'd by the Power of the ſame Element, in a moſt ſurprizing manner, from Heaven, tho not from the Earth as the other was. Perhaps you'll ſcruple the Belief of this Occurrence, as well as that in debate, and others of the like nature; becauſe there is not altogether ſo full a Confirmation as the nicety of ſome Mens Faith may require. But with reſpect to ſuch, I wou'd take the freedom to ſay, that to diſcredit well nigh all the Miracles ſince the Days of the Apoſtles, recorded in the Primitive Writers of the Church, is as great a Fault as to believe them all without reſerve;*

the one indeed is Credulity which leads to Superſtition, but the other is Scrupuloſity which tends to Unbelief: Errors to be equally avoided by thoſe who are Lovers of the Truth; for thoſe who are ſo indeed, the Truth doth make them free, free both from Bigotry and Scepticiſm in Religion, and Partiality and Prejudice in Opinion; ſo that they are neither implicitly tenacious on the one hand, nor doubting of every thing on the other; neither over-fond of their own Conceits, nor blind and averſe towards thoſe of other Men; but as ſincere Lovers of the Truth, very indifferent, ſo they poſſeſs it, whether it be by their own or any other's Diſcovery; and have no other Shyneſs about receiving it, but that they be not impos'd on, and take counterfeit, and what will not bear the Touch, for genuine and real Truth, but act according to the Divine Rule which came from the Father of Light and Truth, Try all things, hold faſt that which is good. *For indeed the Mind of Man evermore deſires to know the Truth, according to the moſt infallible certainty which the nature of things can yield; and 'tis*

hard

hard to know what other way Men can come at Truth, to lay hold of it, if they do not dig for it as for Gold and hid Treaſure, eſpecially when bury'd in the rubbiſh of Antiquity. The latter part of this laſt Period, next to the Book of God, I muſt own my ſelf indebted for to two of the greateſt Men, in their way, which our Nation has produc'd, HOOKER *and* LOCKE. *The one a Perſon of the largeſt Mind, cleareſt Thought, and ſtrongeſt Reaſon, who wanted only a longer time to ſtudy the Scriptures to have made himſelf a complete Chriſtian, and to have been, as the other was, of the moſt orthodox Faith, with the meekeſt Wiſdom, and ſoundeſt Judgment; who had all the Piety and prudent Zeal of the Antients, and all the Accuracy and Solidity of the Moderns.*

I HAVE but a Word or two more, and ſhall deliver you from the Fatigue of my Diſcourſe. You have prepar'd an Objection for me, which I ſhan't uſe; for I won't ſuppoſe the Chriſtians to be Forgers of the Miracle. Quite otherwiſe, if it is a Lye, as I think it not, the

the Gentiles were alone the Forgers; because they are ſo particular in the Account, and ſo diſagreeing in the Cauſe of it. The flattering Orators attribute it to MARCUS's *Piety, the Hiſtorians to the Power of Magick; whereas all the Chriſtian Writers agree in aſcribing it to the Prayers of the Chriſtian Soldiers. But ſince both Heathens and Chriſtians, with one conſent, own the Fact miraculous (as I have before obſerv'd) I can't ſee what Reaſon we have to diſagree with them, ſeeing we are ſo much farther diſtant from knowing the Truth of it; and ſince it was never queſtion'd in all the Ages before us, as it wou'd have been in the firſt Ages, had the matter of fact been falſe, which I verily believe it was not, both from what has been before ſaid, and from the Pagans owning it to be done by the* Chaldæan *Magick, and* Carminibus, *and Conſecration, as* CLAUDIAN *and* LAMPRIDIUS: *by which nothing elſe is meant but the Prayers and Hymns of the Chriſtians, which they made uſe of to obtain that memorable Aſſiſtance from Heaven, whereby themſelves were refreſh'd and their Enemies overcome. But what is*

this

this Chaldæan Magick, *you'll ſay, to Chriſtians?* *'Tis notorious the Gentiles commonly look'd upon them as* Magicians, *eſteem'd them a Sect of the* Jews, *and often confounded them together. The* Jews, *you know, were frequently call'd* Chaldæans, SOLOMON's Proverbs *was quoted as a Book of the* Chaldees, *and our Saviour ſtyl'd* Puer Chaldæus, *in an Oracle produc'd (as I think) by* PORPHYRY. *So that I'm verily perſuaded, it was the common Report that the Victory was obtain'd by the means of the Chriſtians, whom the Gentiles maliciouſly nam'd* Chaldæan Magicians.

AS for the other Stories, which you term the Forgeries of thoſe Ages, particularly the Sibylline *Oracles, and* JOSEPHUS's *Teſtimony, all that I will ſay at preſent ſhall be in the Words of* Iſ. VOSSIUS, de Sibyllinis Oraculis, *where he alſo ſpeaks of a certain Paſſage in* Tertull. Apolog. *c.* 5. Deſinant itaq; hodierni Chriſtiani veteribus illudere Chriſtianis, eorumq; ſugillare credulitatem. Si illos rideamus, meritò quoq; ipſos rideamus Prophetas, è quorum libris pleraq; hæc de-

deprompta fuere oracula. Sed profectò nullos Religio Chriſtiana infenſiores habet hoſtes, quam ipſos Chriſtianos, cum vix illum apud antiquos de Chriſto aut vaticinium, aut teſtimonium invenias, quod non complures etiam doctiſſimi viri labefactare, aut etiam penitus evertere, fuerint conati, *p.* 260. *With which excellent Sentence I will ſhut up my Diſcourſe, ſubmitting it, with all its Errors and Imperfections (unto which I know my ſelf but too ſubject) to the candid Judgment of a Perſon, who, as he is a diligent Searcher after Truth, ſo has he a tender Regard for all thoſe who endeavour, tho by different ways, to find it; knowing that ſuch evermore is the final Victory of Truth, that both Victors and Vanquiſh'd equally rejoice together in her glorious Triumph, Truth being their only aim.*

LET-

LETTER II.

Mr. MOYLE's *Defence of the firſt Article,*

That there was not an intire Legion of Chriſtians in the Army of ANTONINUS.

SIR,

IN your Examination of the firſt Part of this Article, tho you are pleas'd to deny all my Premiſes, you are ſo kind as to grant my Concluſion.

THO by this Conceſſion you have given up the only Point there contended for, and your Diſpute on this head is at an end; yet ſince you have thought fit to ſtep out of your way to conſider ſo very minutely all the Proofs I had offer'd on that Subject, you will give me leave to follow your own Method, and to defend theſe Propoſitions on which my Concluſion, which you allow, is founded.

§ 1. IN

§ 1. IN the firſt place, to prove the Chriſtians of that Age more numerous than I ſuppoſe them, you produce the Authority of LUCIAN in his *Pſeudomantis*, where 'tis ſaid that PONTUS was fill'd with Atheiſts and Chriſtians. By Atheiſts 'tis plain the Epicureans are meant, as appears from the foregoing Sentence, and from *p.* 770. 4. Now 'tis certain that the Epicureans were more numerous than any other Sect of Philoſophers, as we are aſſur'd by CICERO, (*de Finibus* i. 7. *l.* ii. 14. *Tuſc. Quæſt.* i. 4. *l.* v. 10.) and 'tis no wonder, as CICERO ſays, that the Multitude gave into Principles ſo agreeable to Fleſh and Blood. 'Tis as plain there were many of them in *Pontus* (*Lucian* ib. *p.* 763.) and that this Reflection was mainly levell'd at them, who, as LUCIAN aſſures us, (*p.* 762, 3.) were the moſt formidable Party the Impoſtor had to deal with. So that all you can infer from this Paſſage is, that there were many Epicureans and ſome Chriſtians in *Pontus*. And after all, this is not ſaid by LUCIAN but by the Impoſtor, who in all likelihood magnify'd the

the numbers of both, the more to inflame the Mob againſt them.

YOUR next Argument is drawn from PLINY, in his celebrated Epiſtle. I own that he ſeems at firſt ſight to repreſent the Chriſtians as a conſiderable Party in that part of *Bithynia* where he reſided, tho upon trial he did not find their numbers ſo great as he expected. But does not TACITUS (*Ann.* XV. 44.) ſay the very ſame thing, that there was an *ingens multitudo* of Chriſtians at *Rome* under NERO within thirty five Years after the Paſſion of our Saviour? where 'tis a jeſt to ſuppoſe them ſo numerous as to bear the leaſt Proportion with the Heathens. This Paſſage of TACITUS is the beſt Comment on PLINY's Epiſtle. But indeed no certain Conſequence can be drawn from Authors who write in ſuch looſe and general Terms, without laying down any certain Rules or Mediums by which we might gueſs at their Meanings. A great number is a relative Expreſſion, and can never be underſtood in any poſitive or determinate Senſe. Theſe Authors might think their numbers great, in thoſe Places,

in

in compariſon of what they were in moſt other Places, or conſidering the late riſe of their Religion; or, which is moſt likely, they might think them many to abandon the eſtabliſh'd Religion of the World. Of this kind I can produce you two parallel Inſtances, out of the moſt celebrated Writers of Antiquity, CICERO and LIVY; and 'tis in this laſt Senſe they are both to be underſtood. CICERO (*pro Flacco*, *c.* 28.) ſays there was a great Multitude of *Jews* at *Rome*, and that they bore ſuch a ſway in the popular Aſſemblies, that for fear of them he durſt not ſpeak out in defence of his Client; and yet this mighty number, which muſt have very much increas'd by the Incouragement they all along receiv'd from CÆSAR and AUGUSTUS, did not, above fifty Years after, exceed eight thouſand Perſons; as we are aſſur'd by JOSEPHUS, *Antiq.* xviii. 12. LIVY, in his Relation of the *Bacchanalia* at *Rome*, (*l.* xxxix.) makes the Diſcoverer and the Conſul talk of the numbers that were initiated in theſe Myſteries in ſuch high and extravagant Terms (*alter prope populus*, c. 13. 15, 16.) that one wou'd think half *Rome* had been ingag'd in the Faction;

tion, yet he himſelf (*c.* 17.) owns they amounted to no more than ſeven thouſand. Beſides, great Abatements muſt be made for Rhetorical Flouriſhes, with which the beſt Writers are apt to adorn their Relations. 'Tis with theſe Allowances that PHILO, in his Embaſſy to CALIGULA, muſt be underſtood, where he ſays, as I remember, that half the World, in his time, were *Jews*; which is falſe and ridiculons, if we take it in the literal Senſe of the Words.

§ 2. AS for your next Witneſs, TERTULLIAN, the Warmth of his Imagination carries him often into Hyperboles, and Strains of Rhetorick, which are apt to impoſe upon a Reader, who does not underſtand them with a Grain of Salt. He tells us, (*Apol.* c. 37.) "that the Chriſtians were far the greater Part of Mankind, that they fill'd the Court, the Camp, the Senate, *&c.*" It wou'd be endleſs to examine every Part of this bold Rant. I ſhall content my ſelf with conſidering the laſt Article; and by the Falſhood of that, you may judge what Credit is due to the reſt. No man, who has the

leaſt Idea of the Hiſtory of that Age, can believe the Chriſtians ſo numerous in the Senate as he pretends. CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, who liv'd and wrote at the ſame time, under SEVERUS's Perſecution, and had his Head turn'd with no Fumes of Fanaticiſm, gives a very different Account of this matter. PLATO, he tells us, in his Deſcription of a complete Philoſopher, among other diſtinguiſhing Marks ſays, He did not know where the Senate-Houſe ſtood. And this Character, ſays CLEMENS, agrees perfectly well with the Chriſtians; which ſhews that he knew of no Senators of their Religion in his time, (*Clemens Alex. Strom.* v. *p.* 596.) And ORIGEN, thro'out his whole *Apology*, conſtantly repreſents the Senate as violent Enemies to Chriſtianity, (*p.* 6, 110, 183.) Nor is there any mention in the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians of Chriſtian Senators, before APOLLONIUS, whom you ſuppoſe, upon St. JEROM's Word, to have been a Senator. And it cannot be inferr'd from EUSEBIUS. But allowing this Fact to be true, 'tis plain there cou'd be no Chriſtian Senators, unleſs they diſſembled their Religion; ſince APOLLONIUS, as ſoon

ſoon as he was diſcover'd, ſuffer'd Martyrdom for his Religion, under a Reign ſo indulgent to Chriſtianity. 'Tis probable indeed, from EUSEBIUS and St. CYPRIAN, that there were ſome few Chriſtian Senators under VALERIAN and GALLIENUS; but the Body of the Senators were ſo far from embracing our Religion, that about eighty Years after the Eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity, they had Strength enough to carry a Vote to petition the Emperor VALENTINIAN II. to reſtore the Altar of Victory (*Symmachi Ep.* 61. *l.* 10.) St. AMBROSE indeed (*Ep.* 1. *ad Valen. contra Symmach.*) ſays, the Chriſtians were then the Majority: But this ſeems very unlikely; for how then came the Heathen to carry ſuch a Vote? And if it had been gain'd by Surprize in a thin Houſe, why had not the Chriſtians, at their next Meeting, unvoted it again? which they never attempted, but contented themſelves with making private Applications to the Emperor to reject the Petition. Under the next Reign they had Intereſt enough in the Houſe to paſs the ſame Vote, and to prevail with the Emperor, tho a Chriſtian, to grant it, (*Ambroſ. Ep. ad*

Eugen.) and after the Defeat of EUGENIUS the Senate ſtuck firmly to their old Idolatry, and cou'd not be prevail'd on by THEODOSIUS to embrace Chriſtianity, (*Zoſimus*, *l.* iv. *p.* 283.) tho ſhortly after under HONORIUS, the greateſt part of them turn'd with the Tide, (*Pruden. contra Symm.*)

§ 3. IN the next place, there were ſuch Teſts impos'd on all Senators as made it impoſſible for them to appear, and act in the Houſe without renouncing their Religion. Before they enter'd upon Buſineſs, every Senator was oblig'd *Thure & mero ſupplicare apud Aram ejus Dei in cujus Templo coiretur*, (Suet. in Aug. 35.) And the ſame is confirm'd by DIO, (*p.* 542.) and the Senate was always to be held in a Temple, (*A. Gellius* 14. 7. *Servius ad Æn.* vii. 153, 174.) The *Curia Julia* was the Place where they commonly met, which was conſecrated by AUGUSTUS, who ſet up the Image of Victory in it, which was ſtanding there in DIO's Time, (*p.* 459.) and continu'd many Years after the Eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity. Nor cou'd the Chriſtian Senators abſent themſelves

ſelves from the Houſe, for they were oblig'd to attend whether they wou'd or no, (*Ambroſ. ib.*) Beſides all this, the Senators were oblig'd to take the Oath of Fidelity to the Emperor, at the Altar of Victory, (*Symm. ib. Ambroſ. Ep.* 2. *contra Symm.*) and there they were ſworn before they gave their Votes, *Jurati ad Aram Simulachri in Sententiam cogerentur*, (*Ambro. Ep.* 1. *ib.*) to which Cuſtom TACITUS ſeems to allude (*Ann.* 1. *c.* 74.) And can you imagine that a Chriſtian cou'd comply with all theſe Heatheniſh Superſtitions, eſpecially when St. AMBROSE aſſures us that the Chriſtian Senators, in his time declar'd, that if the Altar of Victory, and thoſe idolatrous Ceremonies were reſtor'd, they cou'd not attend with a ſafe Conſcience, tho they were not then oblig'd to join with the Heathens in them? *Ferendumne eſt ut Gentilis ſacrificet & Chriſtianus interſit?* (Ambro. Ep. 2.) *quod——inviti Chriſtiani intereſſe ſacrificiis cogerentur*, (Idem. Ep. 1.) Thus, Sir, I think I have abundantly demonſtrated the Falſhood of this Article in TERTULLIAN, which is ſufficient to give you a taſte of his Sincerity and Exactneſs

in the reſt of them. I have a juſt Value for his Wit and Learning, but you muſt pardon me if I can't prevail with my ſelf to give credit to all the extravagant Flights which occur ſo frequently in his Writings; of which I ſhall only ſingle out two for a Specimen of the reſt. The firſt is a Relation of an *African* Propheteſs, to whom an human Soul appear'd bodily, *Oſtenſa eſt—anima corporaliter* (*de Anima* c. 9.) and for the Truth of which God Almighty is ſolemnly call'd to witneſs. The other is a Viſion of a great City (the heavenly *Jeruſalem*) which was ſeen hanging over *Judea* forty Mornings together, which he pretends was atteſted by the Heathens themſelves, who accompany'd SEVERUS in his Eaſtern Expedition, and who, in all likelihood, invented this Lye on purpoſe to abuſe the Chriſtians, (*contra Marcionem*, l. iii. c. 24.) This is a very extraordinary Story, and 'tis great pity that Biſhop PEARSON, when his hand was in, (*Lect. in Acta Apoſt.* p. 65.) had not gone on to vindicate the Credit of his *Vir grævis*, &c. even in this Relation, againſt the Calumnies of TANFABER, who had the Impudence to queſtion

queſtion the Truth of this Caſtle in the Air. But 'tis time to return to my Subject.

§ 4. BISHOP BURNET was no ſtranger to TERTULLIAN's Character, and had too much Judgment to lay any ſtreſs on ſuch Rhetorical Rants. He has made a judicious Eſtimate of the number of the Chriſtians at *Rome*, from ſome poſitive and certain Mediums laid down by CORNELIUS, in his Letter (*apud Euſeb.* l. vi. c. 43.) *viz.* the number of their Presbyters, and their Poor. To which of the Biſhop's Calculations do you except? Is not a thouſand Souls a ſufficient Allowance for one Presbyter, in an Age when the Flock was minded more than the Fleece? Has he increas'd the number of the Poor beyond their juſt Proportion? That no man will ſay, who conſiders that the far greater part of the Chriſtians, at that time, conſiſted of the loweſt and pooreſt Rank of the People, as is conſtantly objected to them by their Adverſaries, and never diſown'd by the Apologiſts. I ſhou'd be glad to ſee your Arguments againſt the Biſhop's Calculation; for you have offer'd

none in your Anſwer. In the mean time, you muſt give me leave to think, that the Biſhop has juſtly computed them not to exceed fifty thouſand Souls; which, as CORNELIUS ſays, is a very great number. Now, if we reckon four Millions of People at *Rome*, which is a moderate Computation, for ISAAC VOSSIUS makes them fourteen Millions, (*Variæ Obſerv.* p. 34.) the Chriſtians wou'd amount to an eightieth part of the Inhabitants. And if we conſider that this Letter of CORNELIUS was written above ſeventy Years after the Death of ANTONINUS, and that in this Interval there were two long Tolerations, the firſt of twenty two Years, from the Death of ANTONINUS to the 10th of SEVERUS; and the ſecond of thirty eight Years, from the Death of SEVERUS (for MAXIMIN's Perſecution is not worth taking notice of) to the beginning of DECIUS, we may reaſonably conclude, that their numbers were then double to what they were under ANTONINUS; which will reduce them, in his time, to the hundred and ſixtieth part of the Inhabitants. In the Reign of that Prince there were about forty ſtanding Legions. So that if you

you ſuppoſe the Chriſtians to have been liſted in proportion to their Numbers, their Quota in the Army cou'd not riſe to above a fourth part of a Legion; nor ſo high as that, if we conſider that the Chriſtians were leſs numerous in other Cities than in *Rome*, and much fewer in the Country Villages, where the Legions were commonly rais'd, than in the Cities, as I ſhall prove in the following Sections.

§ 5. IN the next place, you deny *Rome* to be the head Quarters of Chriſtianity. But what ſay you to St. CYPRIAN, (*Ep.* 59. *p.* 266. *Amſterd. Ed.*) who calls it the *Eccleſia Principalis*? What Anſwer can you make to the expreſs Teſtimony of IRENÆUS, (*l.* iii. *c.* 3.) who gives it the Preheminence above all other Churches, and ſays, 'twas the *Eccleſia antiquiſſima, & maxima*, i. e. *populoſiſſima*, ſay GRABE, and all the Proteſtant Criticks. IRENÆUS a little lower adds the Reaſon why it was the moſt populous Church in the World, becauſe of the great Reſort of Chriſtians, who flock'd thither from all parts of the Empire: which agrees very well with TACITUS, (*Ann.* XV. 44.) *quo cuncta*

cuncta undiq; atrocia—confluunt celebranturque: by which he means foreign Rites and Religions, eſpecially the Jewiſh and the Chriſtian; which laſt, as appears from this very Paſſage, had a flouriſhing Church at *Rome*, in the very Infancy of Chriſtianity, and from whence it ſpread into all the Weſtern Provinces of *Europe*. 'Twas the Greatneſs and Reputation of this Church which drew all the Founders of new Sects thither, as SIMON MAGUS, (*Euſeb.* ii. 13.) MARCION, (*Tertull. de præſcript.* c. 30.) MARCELLINA, (*Irenæus* p. 101.) CERDON, (*p.* 103.) VALENTINUS, (*p.* 206.) PRAXAS, (*Tertull. adverſus Prax.* c. 1.) NOVATUS, (*Cypr. Ep. paſſim*) with many others, to vent their Hereſies on a larger Scene. And 'twas for the ſame Reaſon that ſo many Controverſies and Diſputes in other Churches came to be decided at *Rome*, tho that See, in thoſe Ages, never laid claim to any ſuch Juriſdiction as the Popes have ſince challeng'd. Theſe Authorities do plainly demonſtrate that *Rome* was the Capital of Chriſtianity as well as the Empire.

§ 6.

§ 6. YOU go on to prove *Epheſus* the head Quarters of Chriſtianity, from the numbers of Chriſtians with which the neighbouring Provinces were well nigh peopled: But this you aſſert without any other Proof than what has been already anſwer'd. How your next Argument, drawn from St. JOHN's reſiding at *Epheſus*, and his naming it before the ſix other Churches in the *Revelation*, and from the Pro-conſul's being oblig'd, by an Imperial Edict, to land there when he took poſſeſſion of his Government, can prove that City the head Quarters of Chriſtianity, I am at a loſs to comprehend. Nor are you more fortunate in the Chronology of this Edict, which you place ſeventy Years after the Death of ANTONINUS; whereas 'tis certain that CARACALLA, who publiſh'd this Edict, as appears from ULPIAN in the Place you cite, dy'd but thirty ſix Years after ANTONINUS. Your next Citation is out of BALDWIN, a modern Writer, whoſe bare Authority is not worth the taking notice of. The Perſecutions in the Proconſular *Aſia*, on which Argument you lay ſuch ſtreſs, were not

owing to the numbers of the Chriſtians, but the Malice of the *Jews*, as Mr. DODWELL has long ago obſerv'd, (*Diſſert. Cyprian.* II. c. 19, 44.) The *Jews* had numerous Settlements in this Province, (*Joſeph. Antiq.* xvi. 4.) eſpecially after their final Diſperſion under ADRIAN; and wherever they prevail'd, never fail'd to inflame the People againſt the Chriſtians, as appears from JUSTIN MARTYR, in his Dialogue held at *Epheſus* with TRYPHON, a celebrated Doctor of the *Jews*, (*p.* 234, 335, 363. *Ed. Col.*) and from the Acts of POLYCARP, who ſuffer'd at *Smyrna* in the ſame Province, and other Authors whom I have cited in the Defence of *Article* III. § 2. But if this Argument from the Perſecutions had any weight in it, it wou'd conclude as ſtrongly for my Hypotheſis; for *Rome* only felt the Fury of the firſt Perſecution, and the ſecond ſeems chiefly to have rag'd there: and in moſt of the following Perſecutions *Rome* had as large a Share as any other Part of the Empire.

§ 7. YOUR next Argument drawn from the two Epiſtles of St. PETER, and

as many of St. PAUL, directed to the Churches in *Aſia*, if it were a good one, wou'd prove *Greece* the Center of Chriſtianity, ſince there are no leſs than ſix Epiſtles of St. PAUL addreſs'd to the *Græcian* Churches in *Europe*; and ſhou'd I allow the following one from the number of the Apologiſts, it will plainly prove that Chriſtianity very often ſhifted its head Quarters. In ADRIAN's time it muſt have been at *Athens*, where QUADRATUS and ARISTIDES, the only Apologiſts under that Reign, reſided; and in the third Century it muſt have been in *Africa*, which had more Apologiſts at that time than any other part of the Empire. And if we are to make an Eſtimate of the number of the Chriſtians in the ſeveral Provinces, from the number of the Apologiſts who flouriſh'd in them, I am afraid we ſhall find no Chriſtians at all in the Weſtern Provinces, ſince they produc'd no Apologiſts till long after the Eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity.

§ 8. In the next place, you are of opinion that the Chriſtians were numerous enough in *Aſia* to ſupply the Army with

Legions.

Legions. But *Aſia* was never the Nurſery of the *Roman* Army, as appears from the whole tenour of their Hiſtory. After AUGUSTUS, for Reaſons of State, had diſarm'd the *Italians*, (*Herod.* ii. 38.) *Hiſpania, Gallicus axis, Illyricumq; latus*, were the warlike Provinces where the Legions were commonly rais'd. The *Aſiaticks* were infamous even to a Proverb for their Softneſs and Luxury, (*Vid. Cic. Ep. Fam.* 151, 378, 9.) and if ever they were employ'd, as they ſometimes were in *Aſia*, they were ſure to diſtinguiſh themſelves by their eminent Cowardiſe; of which we have a remarkable Inſtance under SEVERUS, (*Dio* p. 856.) who has left behind him a true Deſcription of their Proweſs. As for ANTONINUS, he knew their Character too well (*Dio* p. 811.) to incounter the brave Nations of the *North* with ſuch effeminate Troops. His Levies, as 'tis probable, were chiefly made in *Spain*; which CAPITOLINUS (*in Antonino* c. 11. *& ibidem Caſaub.*) ſays, was almoſt diſpeopled with raiſing Recruits. But you never cou'd have worſe apply'd this Argument to any other Reign, or to any other Period of this Reign, more unluckily

luckily than to this very Juncture, when this pretended Miracle was wrought: For 'tis certain that he had no *Aſiatick* Legions in his Army in *Pannonia* at that time, as moſt evidently appears by the Speech he made to incourage his Army, upon the firſt News of the Revolt of CASSIUS, *A. C.* 175. He there tells them that the Troops of CASSIUS were compos'd of *Cilicians*, *Syrians*, and other cowardly *Aſiaticks*, who never were, and never wou'd be, a Match *for them*. Does not this plainly demonſtrate, that he had then no *Aſiatick* Legions in his Army? 'Tis very unlikely that the Chriſtians were numerous enough in the Weſtern Provinces of *Europe* to furniſh whole Legions to the Emperor, ſince we are told by SULPICIUS SEVERUS (*l.* 2.) that it was late before Chriſtianity croſs'd the *Alps*, and that there were no Martyrs ſeen in *Gaul* till the famous Perſecution in *Lyons*. Thus, Sir, I have gone thro all your Arguments, or rather Conjectures, upon this Subject; and I believe by this time you are thorowly ſatisfy'd how little Force they carry with them to prove the Point you contend for, or to bear down the Authority

thority of ſo plain and poſitive a Teſtimony as I have produc'd out of ſo antient a Father as IRENÆUS.

§ 9. I SHALL now paſs on to examine the Argument you have offer'd to prove the Chriſtians as numerous in the Country Villages as the Cities. The only Authority you produce is PLINY's Epiſtle; which I wonder at, ſince I had that very Paſſage in my eye to prove the quite contrary: For do not thoſe Words, *Neq; enim Civitates tantum*, &c. plainly imply, that tho there were ſome Chriſtians in the Country Villages, their numbers were much greater in the Cities? And Biſhop FELL, in his Notes upon that Epiſtle, gives a very good Reaſon for it; becauſe Chriſtianity was planted earlier in the Cities than in the Country. Mr. DODWELL ſays the ſame in his Additions to Biſhop PEARSON's Poſthumous Works, (*p.* 223.) and Dr. CAVE, *Prim. Chriſtianity*, p. 210. I confeſs, I can bring no expreſs Authority for this Opinion from any antient Writer: but ſince we find little or no mention, in thoſe Ages, of any Churches planted, or any Martyrs ſuffering,

ing, or any other remarkable Tranſactions of the Primitive Chriſtians, except in the great Towns and Cities, the modern Authors have very probably concluded that Chriſtianity at that time had made no great Progreſs in the Country Villages: Which Conjecture is very much confirm'd by the late Inſtitution of the *Chorepiſcopi*, or Rural Biſhops. I can find no trace of their Name before the Councils of *Ancyra* and *Neo-Ceſarea* in the beginning of the fourth Century, nor of the thing it ſelf till the middle of the third Century. That this Order was not inſtituted before the beginning of the third Century, is very probable; becauſe the Apoſtolical Canons, which are generally ſuppos'd to have been compil'd about that time, make no mention of it. I am apt to believe it had its firſt Riſe, when the Converts in the Country were grown too numerous for the Inſpection of the City Biſhops. As for your next Obſervation, that Paganiſm ſtill continu'd in the Cities after 'twas quite loſt in the Country, I very much queſtion the Truth of it. I own that DAMASCIUS, AMMONIUS, SIMPLICIUS, and ſome other Philoſophers, flouriſh'd at *Athens*

and *Alexandria*, as low as the ſixth Century, under JUSTINIAN. But how do you know that the Heathen Religion was entirely aboliſh'd in the Country Villages? I cou'd never yet diſcover the preciſe time when the laſt Remains of Paganiſm were quite rooted out of the World; and if you have met with it in the courſe of your Reading, I ſhou'd be oblig'd to you for letting me know it. I can trace Paganiſm as low as the Reign of TIBERIUS II. *A. C.* 581. (*vid. Evagrium.* v. 18.) and yet lower under MAURICIUS, (*Evagr.* vi. 22.) but how long it laſted after that time I know not.

A Defence of the ſecond Part of the firſt Article,

That there were few or no Chriſtians in the Army under ANTONINUS.

§ 1. IN the firſt place I ſhall vindicate my Argument in general from your Objections, and prove it logical and concluſive in all the ſeveral Parts of which it conſiſts.

Firſt,

Firſt, I PRODUC'D divers Writers of that time, all directly, or in conſequence, denying that there were then any Chriſtian Soldiers. Having prov'd the Fact, I proceeded to aſſign the Reaſons of it, *viz.* The idolatrous Teſts impos'd upon all Soldiers, which you neither diſown, nor prove the Chriſtians exempt from, nor ſhew them to be lawful; and therefore my Inference is very juſt, that either there were none in the Army, or elſe they were guilty of groſs Idolatry; and conſequently their Prayers were not likely to work Wonders. This is the Sum and Subſtance of my Argument: And I wou'd fain know where the Sophiſtry of it lies. If you'll pleaſe to conſider it, you'll find that I have drawn juſt and neceſſary Concluſions from clear and certain Premiſes. As for the foot you wou'd put the Argument upon, 'tis againſt all the Rules of right Reaſoning; for 'tis begging the Queſtion, and ſuppoſing the only thing in Debate, *viz.* Whether there were any Chriſtian Soldiers in the Army of ANTONINUS, or not? In the next place, you charge me with an Inconſiſtency, in ſaying, that

under the Perſecutions of the third Century, all Chriſtian Soldiers, who refus'd to ſacrifice to the Heathen Gods, were turn'd out of the Army, tho upon my Suppoſition they cou'd not come into the Army without committing Idolatry; that is, you ſay, tho they were Idolaters they were turn'd out of the Army for not being Idolaters, (you ſhou'd have added *enough.*) And this you reckon a manifeſt Contradiction, and from thence conclude, becauſe the Chriſtian Soldiers made conſcience of committing the laſt and groſſeſt Act of Idolatry, which was downright Apoſtacy, they were wholly free from all other kinds of it. But there is a Paſſage in TERTULLIAN which fairly accounts for this ſeeming Difficulty, and ſhows, that tho thoſe Teſts were really idolatrous, yet ſome corrupt Chriſtians of that time, who comply'd with them, did not think them ſo. 'Tis in his Treatiſe *de Idolo.* c. 2. where he complains of a Set of looſe Caſuiſts in the third Century, who thought nothing Idolatry but being a Pagan Prieſt, or ſacrificing to Pagan Gods; and the main Drift of that Diſcourſe is to lay open the Folly and Falſhood of that

dangerous Doctrine: And to this end he proves there were ſeveral other ſorts of Idolatry, and among the reſt he reckons up theſe very Teſts. So that the Inconſiſtency does not lie in my Argument, but their Practice. I ſhall now paſs on to a more particular Defence of my Arguments on this Subject, to reinforce them with new Proofs, and to examine your Objections againſt them.

§ 2. IT appears from the Teſtimony of ATHENAGORAS and MINUCIUS FELIX, that the paſſive Principles of the Chriſtians of that Age made them think all Bloodſhed, and conſequently War, unlawful: Which is confirm'd by THEOPHILUS ANTIOCHENUS, who aſſigns that Reaſon for their ſhunning the bloody Shows of the Gladiators. And 'tis on the ſame Account that IRENÆUS (*l.* 1. *p.* 31.) charges it as a Crime on the *Valentinians*, that they made no ſcruple to aſſiſt at the barbarous Spectacles (*Homicidiale Spectaculum*, ib.) which are likewiſe condemn'd by TATIAN, (37,40. *Ed. Oxon.*) JUSTIN MARTYR (*Apol.* i. *p.* 44. *Ed. Colon.*) makes the Devil the Author of all War

without diſtinction, and ſo does TATIAN, (*c.* 33.) and in the ſame Chapter he gives broad Intimations of his Opinion concerning the unlawfulneſs of War, as well as JUSTIN MARTYR, (*c.* *p.* 61, 78.) where he likewiſe makes a manifeſt Diſtinction between the Soldiers and Chriſtians, as oppoſite in all reſpects. It ſeems probable from TATIAN, (*c.* 17.) that the Chriſtians declin'd Commands in the Army, τὴν στρατηλάτου παρῃτημαι, *Imperatoriam dignationem aſpernor*, as GESNER's Tranſlation is rightly corrected in the *Cologne* Edition. 'Tis evident from JUSTIN MARTYR, (*p.* 78.) and from IRENÆUS, (*l.* iv. *c.* 67. *p.* 366. *Edit. Grab.*) that there were no Chriſtian Soldiers in the Army in their time, becauſe both affirm that the famous Prophecy of ISAIAH (ii. 4.) was accompliſh'd, and took effect in the Primitive Chriſtians: *Gladios & Lanceas bellatorias — in organa pacifica demutaverunt, & jam neſciunt pugnare*, ſays IRENÆUS, *ib.* And 'tis moſt manifeſt they both underſtood this Prophecy in a literal Senſe. 'Tis in the ſame manner that JUSTIN interprets the like Prophecy of MICAH (iv. 3.) in his Dialogue with

TRY-

TRYPHON, *p.* 337. Even the Author of ANTONINUS's forg'd Epiſtle ſo far obſerv'd the τὸ ἀρχαῖον as to make Fighting contrary to the Principles and Practice of that Age; and therefore he brings in the Chriſtians with no other Arms but thoſe admirable ones of Prayers and Tears. I wou'd fain know what that Sect of the *Nicolaitans* was which EPIPHANIUS ſtyles στρατιώτας, (*p.* 77. *Ed. Pet.*) I can't find the Reaſon of the Name in any antient Writers; and therefore am apt to conclude, from the Etymology of the Word, that 'twas a Term of Reproach faſten'd on them by the Orthodox, for their ſerving, or holding it lawful to ſerve, in the Armies. All theſe Authors do directly, or in conſequence, deny the Lawfulneſs of War; and not only repreſent it as their own private Opinion, but as agreeable to the univerſal Belief and Practice of that Age. And I don't ſee what can be reaſonably oppos'd to the Authority of every individual Writer of the ſecond Century, who wrote near the Age of ANTONINUS. In the next place, I ſhall produce the expreſs Teſtimony of CELSUS, (*p.* 426.) where he charges the

Chriſtians with refuſing to bear Arms for the Emperor. And if this is not a Charge, as you ſuppoſe, but an Admonition, 'tis at leaſt ſuch an Admonition as manifeſtly implies a Charge, as you may ſee if you pleaſe to compare it with *p.* 423. where he tells the Chriſtians, that if the reſt of the Empire were of their Opinion, it wou'd ſoon be over-run by the Barbarians; which is a plain Proof that there were then no Chriſtian Soldiers. But to ſet this matter beyond all diſpute, ORIGEN, who had the whole Works of CELSUS entire, who had read him with ſo much Attention, and anſwer'd him with ſo much Wit and Learning, and conſequently was better qualify'd to know his Meaning than any Man now living, underſtands it as a direct Charge, and owns the Fact to be true; which, by the way, is another Authority againſt you. As for his Opinion of the Unlawfulneſs of War, I lay as little ſtreſs upon it as you; for I produc'd his Teſtimony not as a Caſuiſt, or Divine, but as an Hiſtorian confirming the Truth of CELSUS's Accuſation againſt the Chriſtians. I wou'd fain know whether this Cloud of Witneſſes is not ſufficient to

over-

over-ballance the ſingle Authority of ſo credulous a Writer as TERTULLIAN. In the next place, I ſhall conſider your Objections againſt this Head.

§ 3. THE firſt Authority you produce is a Paſſage of CLEMENS ALEX. (*in his Pædag.* ii. 11. *p.* 205. *Ed. Colon.*) Ἀνδρὶ δὲ εὖ μάλα ἁρμόδιον ἀνυποδησία πλὴν εἰ μὴ στρατεύοντι· 'Tis decent for a Man to go barefoot unleſs he be a Soldier; for the Soldiers were oblig'd to uſe the *Caliga.* And CLEMENS in another place (*p.* 244.) ſays, στρατιώτου—ἐστιν οἰκεία στολὴ — That they wore a Habit peculiar to themſelves. The Practice of this Rule he recommends to the Chriſtians in particular; but the Reaſon he gives for it is general, and includes all Mankind alike; becauſe 'twas becoming every Man (ἀνδρὶ in oppoſition to Women) except he were a Soldier. So that I can't ſee how you can infer from this Paſſage that there were then any Chriſtian Soldiers. But underſtanding it in your Senſe, how do you prove that he does not mean the *Milites cohortales*, who wore the ſame Habit, and had the ſame Names, Ranks, and Diſtinctions among them

them as the *Milites caſtrenſes*? and yet they were nothing elſe but the Officers of the Civil Magiſtrates, and never bore Arms. But ſuppoſing it to be meant of the *Milites caſtrenſes*, it proves no more than what I always own'd, that there were Chriſtian Soldiers in the third Century; for CLEMENS wrote in that Age, after the Death of COMMODUS, *A. C.* 192. (*p.* 337, 9.) and even after SEVERUS's Perſecution, which began in the third Century, (*p.* 414, 684.) But how does this Paſſage, underſtood even in your Senſe, prove that CLEMENS allow'd the Lawfulneſs of War? Does it follow, becauſe he mentions Chriſtian Soldiers, that he thought the Profeſſion juſt and warrantable? Does not TERTULLIAN, when the Pagans charg'd the Chriſtians with being uſeleſs to the Commonwealth, reply, *Vobiſcum militamus*, &c? (*Apol.* 42.) And yet 'tis well known that he condemn'd the Practice of ſerving in the Army. But there are other Paſſages in the Works of CLEMENS, which plainly ſhew how ill an Opinion he entertain'd of War, and Chriſtian Soldiers, as *p.* 72. and more plainly, *p.* 134, 164, 498. And does he not (*p.* 244.) deſcribe

describe the Christians by the distinguishing Character of ἀρκικοὶ καὶ σωφρόνες, in opposition to the Soldiers? So that this place of CLEMENS, understood in my Sense, or your own, proves just nothing at all.

§ 4. AS for St. BASIL, your next Witness, (tho I can't find your Citation) I think him clearly against you. Our Fathers, says he, (under CONSTANTINE, &c.) thought Bloodshed in War excusable, I suppose, because it was committed in defence of Virtue and Religion; which plainly shows that he spoke of Christian Soldiers serving under Christian Emperors. And since that was the only Reason why he thought War allowable, 'tis plain by his Principles he cou'd not think it lawful to fight under Heathen Emperors in defence of Idolatry and Superstition. That was one of TERTULLIAN's Arguments against serving in the Pagan Army, *Excubabit (christianus) pro aris quibus renunciavit?* (*De Cor. Militis*, c. 11.) I wonder'd to see you quote the *Clementine Constitutions* as a genuine Work, which is allow'd by all the World to be spurious, and compil'd (according to Bi-

ſhop PEARSON) after the fifth Century, (*Lect. in Acta Apoſt.* p. 46.) As for the Precept there father'd on St. PAUL, it belongs to JOHN *the Baptiſt*, who gave it not to the Heathen, but in all likelihood to the *Jewiſh* Soldiers in the Tetrarchy of HEROD, which the *Romans* were not then poſſeſs'd of. After the *Clementine Conſtitutions*, I expected to ſee you quote thoſe grave and judicious Hiſtorians the *Martyrologiſts*, who wou'd have furniſh'd you with numerous Inſtances of Chriſtian Soldiers in the ſecond Century, of eleven thouſand baniſh'd by TRAJAN, and ten thouſand crucify'd by ADRIAN upon Mount *Ararat*, &c. (*Baron. ad Ann.* 108.) And yet, as wild and extravagant as theſe Relations appear, I can't find that Biſhop PEARSON had any better Authority to affirm, as he does in his Notes upon IGNATIUS's Epiſtles, (*p.* 54.) that there were then many Chriſtian Soldiers in TRAJAN's Army.

§ 5. YOUR Arguments from the New Teſtament are of no weight, unleſs you cou'd produce ſome Precepts given by Chriſt or his Apoſtles to Chriſtian Soldiers con-

continuing in the Army after their Converſion. And as for your Inſtance of CORNELIUS, it ſhall be conſider'd in its proper Place. But the Church, you ſay, never diſallow'd of this Profeſſion, becauſe we have no Examples of any Chriſtian Soldiers cenſur'd, *&c.* If you mean in the ſecond Century, which is all I contend for, the Reaſon is very plain; for there were then no Chriſtian Soldiers, as I have prov'd by the unanimous Teſtimony of all the Fathers of that Age, whoſe Works are unconteſtably genuine, and who, with one conſent, condemn the Doctrine and diſown the Practice. And I wou'd fain know what Reaſon you have to queſtion their Authority. If they have all conſpir'd to miſrepreſent the Senſe of the Age they wrote in, in what other Monuments ſhall we ſearch for it? What general Councils were there in that Age? What Provincial or National Synods do we hear of till the Reign of COMMODUS? And were not thoſe conven'd on the Controverſies about *Eaſter*, and the Hereſy of MONTANUS? And are not the Canons of thoſe Councils loſt? So that we have no other Authority to depend on for the

Opinion

Opinion or Practice of that Age but the united Teſtimony of thoſe Fathers which I have cited. As for the next Century, I make no doubt but there were then Chriſtian Soldiers in the Army; but how far that Uſage was warranted by the Doctrine of the Church, is another Queſtion. Sure I am that 'tis poſitively condemn'd by TERTULLIAN and ORIGEN, and plainly diſlik'd by CLEMENS; and even LACTANTIUS, (vi. 20.) who wrote in the very beginning of the fourth Century, declares expreſly againſt it. So that your negative Argument, drawn from the ſilence of the Councils of that Age, has little Force in it againſt the Authority of four ſuch celebrated Fathers; eſpecially if we conſider how few Councils of that Age are extant, and that they were all aſſembled upon other Occaſions. But what if I can produce the Senſe of the whole Church met in a General Council againſt this Uſage? What ſay you to the twelfth Canon of the Council of *Nice*? (vid. *Zonaram.*) Does it not ſeverely cenſure ſome Perſons for coming back to the Army after they had once left it? This, in my opinion, muſt be underſtood of the

Army

Army of LICINIUS, who was vanquiſh'd and depos'd the Year before, *A. C.* 324. and the Sentence was thunder'd out againſt ſuch Soldiers as quitted the Service, when LICINIUS declar'd againſt Chriſtianity, out of mere Conſcience, and afterwards return'd to it out of Intereſt. For it ſeems highly improbable that the Council wou'd paſs ſo hard a Cenſure on the Chriſtian Soldiers, who ſerv'd in the Army of their great Patron and Deliverer CONSTANTINE; nor do I think the Church ever held it unlawful to ſerve under Chriſtian Emperors. SALMASIUS has given another turn to this Canon, which is more favourable to my Hypotheſis than my own Explication: For he ſeems to ſuppoſe the Council condemn'd all Soldiers who liſted themſelves voluntarily in the Army under Heathen or Chriſtian Emperors; which laſt I can hardly believe, for Reaſons already alledg'd. As for JUSTEL's Expoſition of this Canon, I ſhall not be at the Pains of tranſcribing it, becauſe you may conſult him your ſelf in his Notes on the Council of *Nice*. To me it ſeems forc'd, unnatural, and ill-grounded, being neither agreeable

agreeable to the Words and Tenour of the Canon, or the Practice of that time.

§ 6. HAVING prov'd by the Authority of ſo many Witneſſes, that the Primitive Chriſtians, by reaſon of their paſſive Principles founded on ſome miſtaken Texts of Scripture, held War in general to be inconſiſtent with Chriſtianity, I ſhall paſs on to thoſe idolatrous Teſts which made them think it particularly unlawful to ſerve in the *Roman* Armies I ſhall prove there were ſuch Teſts, that they were not diſpens'd with, and that they were unlawful. I ſhall begin with the military Oath. Swearing by the Majeſty of the Emperor was no part of the Soldiers Oath, that I know of, till the Eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity. Swearing by the Emperor's Health (for ſo *Salus* is render'd by DIO, *p.* 267.) was probably part of the Oath. The Form of this Oath, under the Commonwealth, is uncertain, tho it may be gueſs'd at from LIVY (ii. 45.) But this we are ſure of, that 'twas by the Pagan Gods; for SCIPIO, in his Speech to his mutinous Soldiers, upbraids them with want of Reverence to the *Deos ſacramenti*

menti teſtes, (*Liv.* xxviii. 27.) The Form of the Oath under the Emperors is uncertain likewiſe, but 'tis moſt evident 'twas by the Pagan Gods, as expreſly appears from SEVERUS's Speech to his Army in praiſe of their Loyalty, τὸ πίστον ὑμῶν καὶ πρὸς τὰ θεῖα σεβάσμιον ἐς ὄμνυσι, (*Herod.* ii. 36. *Ox. Edit.*) and from the Speech of the Emperor MAXIMUS, in the ſame Author, (viii. 19.) θεοὺς ἐς ὁμωμόκασι. TACITUS alludes to it, (*Hiſt.* iv. 58.) *Inter recens & vetus ſacramentum inviſi Diis errabitis.* 'Tis probable that this Oath, as 'twas new modell'd by AUGUSTUS, (*Dio*, p. 603.) was very little different from the common Oath of Fidelity to the Emperor, which ſeems to have been by all the Gods, (*Appian de B. Civil.* l. ii. p. 845.) to which the Health and *Genius* of the Emperor was added by the Senate, under JULIUS CÆSAR, (*Dio*, p. 243, 267.) which continu'd in force till TIBERIUS declin'd that Honour, (*Dio*, p. 607.) which he afterwards accepted, (622, 629.) And CALIGULA put ſome Perſons to death for omitting to ſwear by his *Genius*, (*Suet.* c. 27.) There is no doubt but it ſtill continu'd in force un-

der the ſucceeding Emperors; for there are Medals inſcrib'd *Genio Neronis*, and an Inſcription in GRUTER, (*p.* 1085, 6.) *Genio Antonini Pii.* The Soldiers ſwore by the *Genius* of PLAUTIANUS, who was rather a Partner of the Empire with SEVERUS than a Miniſter, (*Dio*, p. 857.) as they had formerly done by that of SEJANUS and TIBERIUS, (*Dio*, p. 622.) And it appears from APULEIUS, (*l.* ix. *ſub finem*) that 'twas the ordinary Oath of the Soldiers before the Civil Magiſtrates, and 'twas commonly us'd in deciding Controverſies in Law, (*Dig.* l. xii. tit. 2. c. 5.) The *Tyrians* of *Puteoli*, in their Letter to their Countrymen in *Phenicia*, (*Grut. Inſcript.* 1105. 3.) which bears Date the ſame Year with this Miracle, ſwear by all the Gods, and the *Genius* of ANTONINUS; which laſt was certainly at that time part of the common Oath of Fidelity, as appears by the Inſtance of CASSIUS in TERTULLIAN, who rebell'd under that Reign, (*ad Scapulam*, c. 2.) The ſame is confirm'd by the Chriſtian Writers, the *Acta Polycarpi*, ORIGEN, (*p.* 420.) MINUCIUS FELIX, (*p.* 283.) and TERTULLIAN's *Apol.* (*c.* 32.) where you

may

may ſee what opinion the Chriſtians entertain'd of it. From what I have ſaid, it appears very certain that the Soldiers, in their military Oath, ſwore by the Pagan Gods, and probably by the Health and Genius of the Emperor, *V. Apul. Met.* p. 311.

§ 7. THAT theſe Teſts were never diſpens'd with, is evident to any man who conſiders the Conſtitution of the *Roman* Army. The Soldiers, as ſoon as they were liſted, were immediately ſworn, ſays POLYBIUS, (*l.* vi. *p.* 650.) The *Sacramentum* made them *ſola legitima militia*, according to SERVIUS, (*ad Æn.* 8. 1.) Nor was it lawful to bear Arms or fight without that Oath, (*Cicero de Offic.* i. 11. *Plut. Rom. Quæſt.* c. 39.) nor if a Soldier was converted after his taking Service in the Army, was it poſſible to evade the military Oath, becauſe 'twas renew'd every Year, (*Plin. l.* x. *Ep.* 60. *Paneg.* c. 68. *Plut. in Galb.* p. 1505. *Suet. in Galb.* c. 16. *Tac. Hiſt.* i. 55.) And 'tis a jeſt to ſuppoſe that the Chriſtians were excepted from this general Rule. The Emperor MAXIMUS, in his Speech to the Army, (*He-*

rod. viii. 19.) calls this Oath the moſt ſacred part of their Conſtitution, the τῆς Ρωμαίων ἀρχῆς σεμνὸν μυστήριον, which was very true; for under a military Government the publick Safety entirely depends on the Duty and Fidelity of the Army: For which Reaſon, there is no doubt but they took care to guard ſo tender a Point, by impoſing this Teſt on all Soldiers without diſtinction, eſpecially if we conſider that there was no exemption allow'd them from the leaſt of the Heathen Superſtitions, as is apparent from the example of the Soldier in TERTULLIAN, (*de Coron. Mil.* c. 1.) But to prove beyond exception that this Oath was requir'd of the Chriſtians, TERTULLIAN makes it one of his main Arguments againſt the Lawfulneſs of ſerving in the Army, (*De Coron. Milit.* c. 11. *De Idolol.* c. 19.) But to elude the Force of this Argument, perhaps you'll oppoſe the Authority of Dr. CAVE and BARONIUS, who pretend that the military Oath in VEGETIUS (ii. 5.) was the ſame the Chriſtians took under the Heathen Emperors. But this is a ſtrange Miſtake; for that Author, who wrote under VALENTINIAN the ſecond, ſpeaks only of the Oath then us'd

us'd under the Chriſtian Emperors, as *Johan. Sarisberien. de Nugis Curial.* vi. 7. *Stewechius ad Vegetium*, and Archbiſhop USHER, *ad Acta Polycarpi*, rightly underſtood it. This Oath in VEGETIUS is agreeable enough to the common Form us'd by the Chriſtians of thoſe Ages on other Occaſions, as appears by the Example of ZENO a rural Biſhop, who, when he abjur'd his Hereſy in the Council of *Epheſus*, ſwore by the Trinity, and the Piety and Victory of the Emperor. But to imagine that this Oath was adminiſter'd to the Chriſtian Soldiers, under the Heathen Emperors, is a jeſt to any one who conſiders what Opinion the *Roman* Law entertain'd of ſuch Oaths. ULPIAN (*Dig.* 12. *l.* ii. *c.* 5.) declares that all Oaths which imply'd a diſlike of the eſtabliſh'd Religion, were illegal and of no Obligation in Law, even in private Controverſies between man and man: *Siquis illicitum jusjurandum detulerit, ſcilicet improbatæ publicæ religionis*, &c. And I make no doubt but he had the Chriſtians and *Jews* in his eye when he wrote that Sentence.

§ 8. I SHALL in the next place produce the Judgment of the Primitive Fathers againſt the Lawfulneſs of ſwearing by the Heathen Gods; which they were ſo far from allowing, that many of them have ſeem'd to have underſtood the Precept of our Saviour againſt ſwearing without any Exception or Reſerve, and conſequently to have held all Oaths unlawful. Of this number is IRENÆUS, (*l.* ii. *c.* 56.) JUSTIN MARTYR, (*Apol.* ii. *p.* 63.) TERTULLIAN, (*de Idolol.* c. 23. *ad Scap.* c. 2.) and CLEMENS ALEX. tho a Man of freer Thoughts and a larger Mind, ſeems to favour the ſame Opinion, (*p.* 225, 596, 729.) We have an Example in EUSEBIUS (vi. 5.) of a Chriſtian who held it unlawful τὸ παραπαν ὀμνύναι. And even as low as the fourth Century, St. CHRYSOSTOM, BASIL, and St. JEROM, were not entirely free from this Error, as I find them cited by DAILLE in his matchleſs Book of the *Right Uſe of the Fathers*. As for Heathen Oaths, they were univerſally condemn'd by the Church as blaſphemous and idolatrous. Not to mention the Example of POLYCARP, and

and the Martyrs of *Lyons* (*Euſeb.* v. 1. *p.* 164.) nor the Authority of TERTULLIAN (*de Idolol.* c. 20.) and ORIGEN, (*p.* 420.) I ſhall content my ſelf with producing this remarkable Teſtimony of St. AMBROSE (*Epiſ.* 1. *ad Valentinianum contra Symmachum*) *Chriſtiani in aram jurare cogentur? Quid eſt jurare niſi ejus quem teſtare fidei tuæ præſulem, divinam potentiam confiteri?* As for the modern Caſuiſts, I ſhall only produce Biſhop SANDERSON, who had more *Logick* and Judgment than all the Fathers put together: He determines expreſly that ſuch Oaths are *planè Idololatrica*, *De Juramenti oblig.* p. 91.

§ 9. THO from the Arguments I had alledg'd in my former Diſcourſe, which you have not thought fit to contradict, it ſufficiently appears that the Soldiers lay under a neceſſity of paying Divine Honours to their Standards, and Statues of the Emperors; yet, to leave no room for doubt, I ſhall advance ſome new Proofs and Authorities to reinforce them. *Ubiq; vim veſtræ Divinitatis eſſe, ubi vultus veſtri, ubi Signa coluntur*, ſays EUME-

NIUS, (*Paneg. ad Conſtantium* c. 15.) *Quæ Signa colunt urbana cohortes.* STATIUS (Syl. 4. v. 9. lib. 1.) See *Minucius Fel.* p. 283. and *Capitol. in Maximo & Balbino*, p. 17. *Imagines Imperatorum — tanquam divina & præſentia Signa ſinguli venerantur*, *ſays* MODESTUS, who wrote under the Emperor TACITUS, (*De rei militar. vocab.* p. 250.) which plainly ſhews there was no Exemption for any Soldier whatſoever. In the Prætorian Camp was a Temple, where thoſe Standards and Statues were ſet up to be ador'd, (*Herod.* iv. 8.) nor were they worſhipp'd with ſimple Adoration only, but even with Incenſe and Sacrifice, as appears from PLINY, (*Ep.* 97. *l.* 10.) DIO, (*p.* 661, 712.) On their Submiſſion to a new Emperor, this Adoration was requir'd of the Army as a Teſt of their Loyalty and Obedience, of which we have a ſignal Example in *Capitolinus*, (*in Maximino*, c. 24.) *Milites recepti, ita ut ante imagines* (*Imperatorum*) *adorarent.* The leaſt Diſreſpect or Indignity offer'd to the Statues of the Emperors paſs'd for High-Treaſon, (*Tac. Ann.* 1. c. 73, 74.) and was reputed a higher Crime in a Soldier, and more ſeverely puniſh'd than in any other.

other. *Crimen majeſtatis — violatis Statuis, vel imaginibus maximè exacerbatur in milites*, ſays MODESTINUS, (*Dig.* 48. *tit.* 4. *c.* 7.) For ſuch an Attempt was conſider'd as an Overt-act of Rebellion; becauſe whenever the Soldiers ſhook off their Allegiance to the Emperors, they always began with affronting and demoliſhing their Statues, (*Herod.* 8. 15. *Tac. Hiſt.* 1. 41.) I hope theſe Authorities are ſufficient to convince you that theſe Teſts were indiſpenſably requir'd of all Soldiers.

§ 10. MY next Buſineſs is to demonſtrate their Unlawfulneſs. And for this I need produce no other Proof than the ſecond Commandment, and the univerſal Senſe of the Primitive Church, as you may ſee in PLINY, (*Ep.* 97. *l.* 10.) and TERTULLIAN, (*de Idol.* c. 20.) To which I might add the concurrent Teſtimony of all the antient Fathers of the three firſt Ages, if it wou'd not look like a vain parade of Reading to heap up Citations in ſo evident a matter. The only Objection I foreſee that can be urg'd to warrant their Lawfulneſs, muſt be drawn from

from the Practice of the Chriſtians in the fourth Century, who made no ſcruple to worſhip the Images of their Emperors. But there is a wide difference between theſe two Caſes; for the Chriſtians worſhipp'd their Emperors as Men, not as Gods, and conſequently with a civil, not a religious Adoration. Tho I am of opinion that the Practice it ſelf, even with the help of this common Diſtinction, was very ſcandalous, and never to be reconcil'd to the ſecond Commandment. I take it to be one of thoſe idolatrous Corruptions which crept into Chriſtianity upon CONSTANTINE's Converſion, with many other Remains of Paganiſm, which were ſtill retain'd, either out of flattery to their Princes, or in compliance with the Heathens: For 'twas long after the Eſtabliſhment of our Religion before the Leven of Heatheniſm was entirely purg'd out of the Church, as I cou'd eaſily make appear by numerous Inſtances; but I ſhall content my ſelf with a few, to give you a taſte of the reſt. To paſs over the blaſphemous Attributes they beſtow'd on their Emperors, as NUMEN, ÆTERNITAS, DIVINITAS, *&c.* and by which Precedents the

the *French* Flatterers juſtify all the impious Titles their grand Monarch has aſſum'd, 'tis moſt certain that the Chriſtian Emperors ſtill retain'd the Name of PONTIFEX MAXIMUS, till the Reign of GRATIAN, as appears from ZOSIMUS, (*l.* iv. *p.* 250. *Ed. Ox.*) and from divers Paſſages in AUSONIUS's Panegyrick to GRATIAN, and from many Medals and Inſcriptions, (vid. *Spanhem. ad Julian.* p. 278.) CONSTANTINE, after his Death, was *inter Deos relatus*, as appears from EUTROPIUS, (*l.* x. 8.) and from the Medal produc'd by SPANHEIM, (*ad Julian.* p. 67.) and was pray'd to, and worſhipp'd as a God by the Chriſtians, if we may believe PHILOSTORGIUS, *l.* ii. *c.* 17. Beſide, the *Solemnis votorum nuncupatio*, which was Heatheniſm with a witneſs, ſtill continu'd, (vid. *Spanhem. ad Julian.* p. 278.) And are not all theſe Inſtances every whit as warrantable as their worſhipping the Statues of their Emperors? which Uſage, as much in faſhion as it was, was condemn'd by the beſt and greateſt Fathers of that Age. CHRYSOSTOM choſe rather to loſe his Biſhoprick a ſecond time, than to connive at the impious Honours which

which were paid to the Statues of the Empreſs EUDOXIA, (*Socrat.* vi. 16. *Sozomen* viii. 20.) and St. AUSTIN, (*De Civit. Dei*, x. 4.) if my Tranſlation be right, ſeems to allude to this Uſage as a peſtilent Piece of Flattery. But St. JEROME determines expreſly againſt it, in thoſe remarkable Words, *Judices & principes ſæculi* (meaning the Chriſtian Magiſtrates) *qui Imperatorum Statuas adorant, & Imagines, hoc ſe facere intelligunt, quod tres pueri facere nolentes placuerunt Deo*, (ad Dan. *c.* 3.) And in the beginning of the fifth Century, THEODOSIUS II. a religious Prince, had ſo juſt a Senſe of this ſhameful and idolatrous Flattery, that he thought fit to aboliſh it by a Law, (*Juſt. Cod. l.* i. *tit.* 24. *c.* 2.)

§ 11. TO illuſtrate this Argument, I ſhall in the next place produce the Judgment of the *Jewiſh* Church upon this Subject; who, as widely as they differ'd from the Chriſtians in other Articles, yet entirely concurr'd with them in their Notions of Idolatry; and therefore their Authority, in this Controverſy, muſt be of very great weight. That the *Jews* thought ſwearing

ing by the Heathen Gods expreſly forbid by the Decalogue, is too plain to need any Proof, (*Spencer de Leg. Heb.* l. i. c. 4. § 12.) And 'tis as certain that they held it unlawful to ſwear by the Heathen Emperors. 'Twas made a Charge againſt them under CALIGULA, that they refus'd to ſwear by his Name, (*Joſ. Antiq.* xviii. 10. *p.* 639.) by which is meant either his bare Name, as in HORACE, *Ep.* 1. *l.* 2. *Jurandaſq; tuum per nomen ponimus aras*, and which the Chriſtians held likewiſe unlawful, (*Origen*, p. 422.) or elſe, which is moſt likely, the common Oath by the Emperor's *Genius*, the Refuſal of which was made a Capital Crime under that Reign, (*Suet. in Calig.* c. 27.) They entertain'd ſuch an Abhorrence of the *Roman* Standards, with the Imperial Statues upon them, that they thought it a Crime to admit them within the Walls of *Jeruſalem*, (*Joſeph. Antiq.* xviii. 4. *p.* 621. *De Bello Jud.* ii. 9. *p.* 789.) or even in any part of their Territories, (*Joſeph. Antiq.* xviii. 7. *p.* 627.) Tho the common Opinion of the *Jews* (for the *Phariſees* were more rigid) did not diſallow of Images in general, provided they were not conſecrated,

and made the Objects of religious Worſhip, as Dr. ALDRICH has very ſolidly prov'd, (*ad Joſeph. de Bello Jud. l.* ii. 9. *Ox. Ed.*) War was never held unlawful by the Jewiſh Principles: yet it is plain they refus'd to liſt themſelves in the *Roman* Legions, as inconſiſtent with their Religion, (*Joſeph. Antiq.* xviii. 5. *p* 623.) by reaſon, in all likelihood, of theſe idolatrous Teſts. And therefore, as a Reward for their eminent Services, they procur'd from JULIUS CÆSAR an Exemption from ſerving in the Wars, (*Joſeph. Antiq.* xiv. 17. *p.* 487, 8.) and from AGRIPPA, (*Antiq.* xvi. 4. *p.* 550) Which Privilege was confirm'd by AGRIPPA. DOLABELLA, I confeſs, in his Edict in their favour, aſſigns other Reaſons for it, as the Obſervation of their Sabbath, and the prohibited Meats: But 'tis plain theſe were not the only Reaſons, becauſe they wou'd have held as ſtrongly againſt the ſerving under XERXES, (*Joſeph.* p. 1047.) and the *Macedonian* Kings of *Syria*, (*Maccab. l.* i. *c.* 11.) which they did not ſcruple; nor did they refuſe to ſerve under JULIUS CÆSAR, (*Antiq.* xiv. 15. *p.* 481.) where they acted only as Confederates and Auxiliaries, under the Com-

Command of their own Officers, and conſequently were exempt from thoſe Teſts which the legionary Soldiers cou'd not be excus'd from.

§ 12. BEFORE I finiſh this Argument, I will firſt add one general Obſervation, That no civil or military Teſt was ever diſpens'd with in favour of the Chriſtians, even under Reigns the moſt indulgent to our Religion; as remarkably appears by the Example of MARINUS, a Soldier under the Emperor GALLIENUS, at a time when the Church injoy'd a profound Peace, as we are aſſur'd by EUSEBIUS, (*Hiſt.* vii. 15.) The ſame is confirm'd by TERTULLIAN, (*de Idol.* c. 17.) He there puts the caſe, Whether it was lawful for a Chriſtian to be a civil Magiſtrate; and ſeems, tho a little ironically, to determine in the Affirmative, provided thoſe idolatrous Teſts (of which he gives us a long Liſt, and moſt whereof were really idolatrous) cou'd be evaded by Fraud or Favour; which caſe he thinks cou'd hardly ever happen, *Si hoc credibile eſt fieri poſſe.* And even this Trick, if it cou'd ever ſucceed, wou'd have been condemn'd by the Chriſtian

Chriſtian Church, as appears by the Caſe of the *Libellatici*, ſo often mention'd by St. CYPRIAN; who, to ſave themſelves from Perſecution, purchas'd Certificates from the Civil Officers, that they had offer'd Sacrifices, tho they really had not: which was decry'd by the Chriſtians of that Age as a mean and unworthy Artifice, and but one Remove from Apoſtacy. The *Jews*, who had commonly more Favour ſhew'd them than the Chriſtians, were ſhut out by the ſame Laws from all Imployments, nor allow'd to bear Office in a Corporation, till SEVERUS admitted them upon Terms conſiſtent with their Religion, (*Dig. l.* 50. *tit.* 2. *c.* 3.) But we meet with no Precedent of this kind in favour of the Chriſtians till the Reign of DIOCLESIAN. And EUSEBIUS, (*Hiſt.* viii. 1.) reckons it a ſingular and peculiar Act of Grace in that Prince, that he diſpens'd with thoſe Laws which requir'd all Men to ſacrifice, as a neceſſary Qualification before they cou'd enter upon any Imployment, (*Euſeb. Hiſt.* vii. 15.) There are ſome other military Teſts, as the *annua votorum Nuncupatio*, &c. which are as inconſiſtent with the Chriſtian Religion as

any

any I have inſiſted on, as you may find in TERTULLIAN, (*de Corona militis*, c. 12. p. 12.) to whom, for brevity's ſake, I refer you.

§ 13. I SHALL now proceed to examine the Objections you have made againſt this Argument. You ſay, the Chriſtians abounded in the Palace, which was fill'd with *Lares*, &c. and that they might live as lawfully in the Camp as in the Court. But is there any parallel berween theſe two Caſes? Have I not prov'd by a Cloud of Witneſſes, that the military Oath, and other idolatrous Teſts, were exacted of the Chriſtian Soldiers? And can you prove by one ſingle Teſtimony, that the Emperor's Domeſticks were oblig'd to worſhip the *Lares*? If they liv'd there free from Idolatry, 'tis becauſe no idolatrous Teſts were requir'd of them. And if they were guilty of it, I hope you will never excuſe the Idolatry of the Camp by that of the Court. If by conſiderable Perſons in the Emperor's Court, you mean Civil Magiſtrates, I readily agree with you, that a Chriſtian might as well be a Soldier as a Magiſtrate: For EUSEBIUS (*l.* vii 15.)

aſſures us that no Man was qualify'd for any Dignity whatſoever without ſacrificing; which is confirm'd by TERTULLIAN, *de Idol.* c. 17. And the far greater part of the firſt-Rate Magiſtrates being Senators, of courſe were liable to all the idolatrous Teſts requir'd of the Senate: for which I refer you to the firſt part of this Article. And 'twas for this Reaſon undoubtedly, that the Primitive Chriſtians declin'd all civil Honours, (*Minutius Fel.* p. 311. *Origen*, p. 426, 7.) But to ſet this matter beyond all diſpute, I ſhall produce the Authority of a whole National Synod at *Elvira* (in the beginning of the fourth Century, not long after DIOCLESIAN's Perſecution broke out) which excludes even Municipal Magiſtrates from the Communion for that Year, in which they bare office in their Boroughs (*Canon* 56.) And this is a plain Proof what Opinion the Church, in that Age, entertain'd of the Lawfulneſs of being a Civil Magiſtrate.

§ 14. THE Chriſtians in the Houſhold of CÆSAR, mention'd by St. PAUL in his Epiſtle to the *Philippians*, were neither Civil Magiſtrates nor conſiderable Perſons:

ſons: for I underſtood the Οἰκία Καίσαρος in the ſame ſenſe as I do *Familia Cæſaris*, in LACTANTIUS, (*de morte Perſec.* c. 14.) for the Emperor's Domeſticks; that is, the Slaves and manumiz'd Servants of the Palace. 'Tis in the ſame manner I interpret IRENÆUS, (*l.* iv. *c.* 49.) where he ſpeaks of the *Fideles in aula Regali*, under COMMODUS. And I am confirm'd in this Thought by the Authority of your admir'd ISAAC VOSSIUS, who (in his Letters to A. RIVET in defence of IGNATIUS's Epiſtles againſt BLONDEL, publiſh'd with Biſhop PEARSON's *Vind. Ignat.*) affirms that the greateſt Part of the Primitive Chriſtians were Slaves. What Reaſon he had for this Opinion I can't gueſs, except the Names of the firſt Converts, which for the moſt part do indeed belong to Slaves; or the Authority of JULIAN, (*apud Cyrillum*, p. 206. *Edit. Spanheim.*) who urges it as an Objection againſt the Honour of Chriſtianity; which is in good part own'd and juſtify'd by St. CYRIL, who expoſes it very handſomly, as it well deſerv'd, for a weak and trifling Argument. As for thoſe Slaves and *Liberti*, they were imploy'd in the low and

ſervile Offices of the Palace, and were in too mean a Station to have any Oaths or Teſts impos'd upon them, or to have any nice Enquiry made after their Religion, and conſequently might live free enough from Idolatry: For 'tis plain from TACITUS, (*Ann.* xiv. 44.) that the *Roman* Servants under NERO were allow'd to be of what Religion they pleas'd: *quibus* (*ſervis*) *externa ſacra aut nulla.* And there is no doubt but by *externa ſacra* he means the Chriſtian and Jewiſh Religions. And this hint of VOSSIUS, if his Notion be right, by the way, helps me to another Argument againſt Chriſtian Soldiers; for Slaves were ſhut out of the *Roman* Army upon pain of Death, (*Dio* p.377. *Plin. Ep.* 39. *l.* 10.) Nor were the *Liberti* ever liſted but upon the moſt preſſing Exigencies, as is manifeſt from the whole courſe of the *Roman* Hiſtories. There is indeed an Inſtance of an eminent Convert of St. PAUL's, SERGIUS PAULUS, the Pro-conſul of CYPRUS, (*Acts* xiii.) And I wonder how ſo pertinent an Inſtance came to eſcape a Man ſo thorowly vers'd in reading of the Bible. But in this caſe, we ought to conſider that SERGIUS PAULUS had paſt thro'

thro' the idolatrous Teſts that were requiſite to qualify him for his Office before his Converſion; and all other Acts of Idolatry he might eaſily avoid, in his own Government, where he had no body to controul him. And the Pro-conſulſhip being an annual Imployment, he might, when his Year was expir'd, retire from publick Buſineſs to a private Life, as I am inclin'd to believe he did; becauſe JULIAN (*apud Cyrillum*, p. 206.) ſays that he made no Figure in the World, and was not taken notice of by any Writer of that Age: which St. CYRIL, in his Anſwer, does not think fit to deny.

§ 15. EPAPHRODITUS was a conſiderable Man at Court, and Maſter of Requeſts to NERO. But is there the leaſt Probability, or Proof, that this EPAPHRODITUS was the ſame with St. PAUL's? Do you, in good earneſt, believe that NERO's Maſter of Requeſts was imploy'd as a Meſſenger to carry Letters backward and forward between St. PAUL and the *Philippians*? Can you imagine that the Biſhop of *Philippi* (for ſo THEODORET ſays he was) wou'd accept an Office in

the Court, which oblig'd him to a conſtant Abſence from his Paſtoral Charge? And wou'd not this be an excellent Argument to Court-Biſhops to prove the Apoſtolical Inſtitution of Non-Reſidence? For my part, I can as ſoon believe that TIGELLINUS and PETRONIUS ARBITER were Chriſtians as EPAPHRODITUS, who was a known Favourite of NERO's, and follow'd his Fortunes to the laſt; and, in concluſion, help'd him to murder himſelf: which, by the way, is an excellent ſign of his being a Chriſtian. And for this very Fact he was afterwards put to death, but not martyr'd, by DOMITIAN, as we are told by SUETONIUS, (in *Domit.* c. 14. and *Dio*, p. 766) And PLINY alludes to it in his *Panegyrick*, c. 53. If you can produce the Authority of any profane or eccleſiaſtical Writer that he ſuffer'd Martyrdom, I am content to give up the whole Controverſy. I thought you had been the firſt Author of this ſtrange Paradox; but BERKELIUS and SALDENUS had the ſtart of you, as I find in ALBERTUS FABRITIUS, *Bibliotheca Græca*, *l.* iv. *p.* 257. And the Cenſure he paſſes on the Opinion of thoſe two Criticks, very well deſerves

your

your Reading. I am very willing to believe upon your Authority, that JOSEPHUS dedicated his Hiſtory to this ſame EPAPHRODITUS; but I muſt firſt beg of you to reſolve one difficulty, which I can't eaſily get over. JOSEPHUS addreſſes the Hiſtory of his Life to EPAPHRODITUS, (*p.* 1032.) who was doubtleſs the ſame Perſon to whom he inſcribes his Antiquities. In that Book he plainly mentions the Death of King AGRIPPA, (*p.* 1026.) JUSTUS TIBERIENSIS, who was Contemporary with JOSEPHUS, places the Death of that Prince in the third Year of TRAJAN (*apud Photium, cod.* 33. *p.* 20.) But NERO's EPAPHRODITUS was put to death in the fifteenth Year of DOMITIAN, five Years before, (*Dio*, p. 766.) and conſequently the EPAPHRODITUS of JOSEPHUS was a different Perſon. 'Tis true, Mr. DODWELL (*ad Pearſonii op. poſthuma*, p. 173.) corrects this Paſſage of JUSTUS; and inſtead of TRAJAN wou'd ſubſtitute VESPASIAN. And Dr. ALDRICH (*ad Joſeph. de Bello Jud. l.* ii. *c.* 14.) changes the Reading into DOMITIAN. But this is an unſufferable Liberty, to ſet up their own Conjectures without

the leaſt warrant from any Manuſcript to ſupport them. And theſe Corrections are plainly confuted by two excellent Medals produc'd by Mr. SPANHEIM, (*de Uſu Numiſ.* p. 533. *Lond. Edit.*) which prove King AGRIPPA alive in the ſixth and fifteenth Years of DOMITIAN: from whence I conclude, that the common Reading in PHOTIUS is the true one. And if ſo, can any Man believe that JUSTUS cou'd poſſibly miſtake in the Relation of a Fact which fell out in his own Time and Memory?

§ 16. YOUR next Objection is drawn from the Example of CORNELIUS the Centurion; who, you ſay, continu'd in the Army after his Converſion to Chriſtianity. But for this you bring no other Proof but the great Names of SELDEN and GROTIUS; which may be an Argument to my Modeſty, but not to my Judgment. The Bible is ſilent on this head, and the Proofs from thence are equal on both ſides. To me it ſeems moſt probable, that he quitted the Army, if I may be allow'd to argue from the common Practice of the Primitive Converts, who ſold their Lands, parted with

with their Imployments and Profeſſions, and left all to follow Chriſt and the Apoſtles: and TERTULLIAN ſeems plainly to intimate as much, (*de Cor. Mil.* c. 11.) and more plainly, (*de Idol.* c. 19.) And this was certainly the receiv'd Opinion of the antient Church; otherwiſe, after ſo plain a Precedent in Scripture to the contrary, it was impoſſible that all the Fathers of the next Age cou'd have ſo univerſally agreed in decrying the Lawfulneſs of War, and conſequently of ſerving in the Army. But to reduce this Argument to a ſhort Iſſue, either the Teſts before-mention'd were then in force, or they were not; if not, the Example of CORNELIUS can never warrant the Lawfulneſs of ſerving in the Army at a time when we are ſure they were in force: if they were then in force, I wou'd fain know if you think St. PETER wou'd have given the leaſt Countenance to ſuch Idolatry and Hypocriſy. But my Opinion is, that they were then in force, as appears by ſeveral Inſtances I have already produc'd. And 'tis very unlikely they ſhou'd be diſpens'd with under ſuch a blaſphemous idolatrous Tyrant as CALIGULA, in whoſe Reign

BA-

BARONIUS and Biſhop PEARSON (*Annal. Paul.* p. 4.) have rightly plac'd the Converſion of CORNELIUS, and not under TIBERIUS as you ſuppoſe. And beſides theſe Teſts which were common to all Soldiers, 'tis plain from TERTULLIAN, (*de Idol.* c. 19.) that all above the Rank of the *Milites Caligati*, or private Soldiers, lay under the *neceſſitas immolationum*, under the neceſſity of ſacrificing (to the Heathen Gods;) which is confirm'd by EUSEBIUS, (*Hiſt.* vii. 15.) And for thoſe Reaſons I am of opinion that CORNELIUS quitted the Service when he imbrac'd the Chriſtian Religion.

§ 17. I AM very much miſtaken in the nature and force of my Arguments, if I have not prov'd, beyond all reaſonable exception, that there were ſuch military Teſts, that they were impos'd on all Soldiers without diſtinction, and that they were inconſiſtent with Chriſtianity. And from theſe Premiſes there reſults this juſt and neceſſary Concluſion, That there either were no Chriſtians in the Army of ANTONINUS, or elſe that they were guilty of groſs Idolatry, and conſequently were

were uncapable of working Miracles. At the ſame time, I readily own that there were Chriſtian Soldiers in the third Century, who, by the Principles I have laid down, muſt of courſe be Occaſional Conformiſts. To this you object, that if the Chriſtians then ſerv'd in the Army, I ought from thence to have concluded, that they might lawfully do it. But I can never allow this way of reaſoning to be concluſive, till you firſt prove that all the Chriſtians of that Age liv'd up fully to the Principles of their Religion: But till that's done, you muſt give me leave to think that your Argument has more Charity than Force in it, as I ſhall prove by ſome enlightning Inſtances before I have done with this Head. I alledg'd, that this Practice took its riſe in the third Century, when the Severity of the Chriſtian Diſcipline began to abate. But ſince you won't allow that the Chriſtians departed from their primitive Purity before the Reign of CONSTANTINE, much leſs that they were guilty of ſo crying a Corruption as Occaſional Conformity, 'tis my Buſineſs to prove it in the following Sections.

§ 18.

§ 18. WHAT ſay you in the firſt place to CYPRIAN's Complaint of the Corruption of the Chriſtian Diſcipline, about the middle of the third Century? *Traditam divinitus Diſciplinam Pax longa corruperat*, (de lapſis, *p.* 88. Amſter. Ed.) Does not EUSEBIUS (*Hiſt.* viii. 1.) ſet forth the prodigious Decay of the primitive Zeal and Piety, at the end of the ſame Century, in very lively Colours? And does he not derive it from the ſame Cauſe, the too great Eaſe and Plenty they enjoy'd? ἐκ τῆς ἐπὶ πλεῖον εὐθηνίας. Does not TERTULLIAN in effect ſay the ſame thing? (*de Fugâ in Perſecut.* c. 1.) That the Severity of the Chriſtian Diſcipline was rais'd and reviv'd by Perſecution, and conſequently ſlacken'd and grew remiſs under a Toleration. And 'tis to the long Peace the Church enjoy'd from the Death of ANTONINUS to the tenth of SEVERUS, that I aſcribe the Riſe of this Corruption and many others, which are ſet in a true Light by TERTULLIAN, in his Books *de Idolol. de Spectaculis*, &c. This appears even in one Inſtance, which tho in it ſelf very inconſiderable, yet ſhews how faſt the Chriſtians

Chriſtians were declining from their primitive Rigour. 'Tis the caſe of the Soldier who refus'd to wear the Garland of Flowers on the donative Day, and was blam'd for his unſeaſonable Zeal, as they call'd it, by a great number of the Chriſtians of that time: tho till then TERTULLIAN aſſures us that 'twas the receiv'd Opinion, confirm'd by the conſtant Practice of the Church from the firſt Riſe of Chriſtianity, that 'twas unlawful to wear the Garland; which is confirm'd by MINUCIUS FELIX and CLEMENS ALEX. (*Pædag.* ii. 8. *p.* 179, 180, 1.) BARONIUS has very unjuſtly cenſur'd TERTULLIAN for his preciſe Severity on this head; for if he has fairly ſtated the caſe, and theſe Garlands were really worn in honour of the Heathen Gods, as both he and CLEMENS (*ib.*) expreſly affirm, I think his reaſoning to be very right. 'Twou'd be endleſs to recite all the Examples of this kind which you may find in TERTULLIAN; but he has given us one very extraordinary Inſtance, which deſerves to be taken notice of; *Adleguntur in ordinem Eccleſiaſticum Artifices Idolorum*, (de Idol. *c.* 7.) Was not that an excellent Trade

Trade for Clergymen to drive, and is it not a good Argument of the looſe Diſcipline which was growing up in that Age?

§ 19. THERE are numerous Inſtances in that Age of Occaſional Conformity, by which I mean a mercenary Compliance, when there was no Perſecution afoot, with the Pagan Worſhip. TERTULLIAN's whole Book, *de Idolol.* is one continu'd Satire on Occaſional Conformity, of which the Chriſtian Soldiers were notoriouſly guilty, as appears by TERTULLIAN's Soldier, who was not caſhier'd barely for refuſing to wear the Garland, but becauſe by that Act, and afterwards before his Officer, he had declar'd himſelf a Chriſtian; which ſhows that no profeſs'd Chriſtian was then allow'd in the Army, and conſequently that his Comrades who ſtay'd behind, the *tot Commilitones*, all diſſembled their Religion, and conform'd in outward Appearance to Paganiſm: which was agreeable enough to the looſe Principles which began to prevail in that Age, *Nemo ſe debet promulgare*, (Tertull. de Idol. *c.* 22.) Many other Chriſtians of that Age made no conſcience of aſſiſting at the

the Heathen Sacrifices, without any neceſſity, (*Lactant. de mort. Perſec.* c. 10.) And even under JULIAN, (*Pruden. Apotheo. v.* 530, &c.) tho that Uſage was expreſly condemn'd by the Synod of *Elvira*, (*Canon* 59.) But I have another Inſtance behind, which is ſtill more extraordinary. 'Tis of ſome Chriſtians who made no ſcruple of being Heathen Prieſts, (*Lactant. de mort. Perſec.* c. 10.) *Quidam Miniſtrorum ſcientes Dominum cum aſſiſterent immolanti*, &c. What theſe *Miniſtri* were, he explains a little lower, *qui ſacris miniſtrabant*; that is, the loweſt Order of the Pagan Hierarchy, as the *Popæ*, *Victimarii*, *Æditui*, &c. deſcrib'd by MANILIUS, (*l.* v. *v.* 340.) *Atq; auctoratos in tertia jura Miniſtros*; and mention'd by OVID in *Faſt.* i. *v.* 319. *Tac. Ann.* xiii. 27. *Lucan.* i. *v.* 612. *Juvenal Sat.* xii. *v.* 14. *Schol. Virgil. Georg.* iii. *v.* 488. *Servius ad Æn.* viii. *v.* 270. *ad Æn.* xi. *v.* 558. who all uſe the word *Miniſter* in the ſame Senſe, as I underſtand it in LACTANTIUS. And that 'twas no uncommon Practice for Chriſtians to accept of Heathen Prieſthoods, is moſt certain from the Council of *Elvira* (in the very beginning of the

fourth Century) which was forc'd to make ſeveral Canons to forbid that ſcandalous Uſage, (*Can.* 2, 3, 4, 55.) which are admirably well explain'd by Mr. AUBESPINE Biſhop of *Orleans*, in his learned Notes on that Synod; where he has fully prov'd that this infamous Cuſtom continu'd long after the Eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity. After theſe notorious Inſtances, I hope you will allow that there was ſuch a thing in thoſe times as Occaſional Conformity, and founded on the ſame mercenary Principles, but infinitely more ſcandalous than that of the preſent Age. I am ſenſible theſe are ſhocking and invidious Truths, and very contrary to the Ideas we have taken up of the univerſal Sanctity and Purity of the Chriſtians in thoſe Times, upon the Credit of HALLOIX, CAVE, DUPIN, and other ſecond-hand Writers, who are all Praiſe and Panegyrick on this Subject, and have ſhown us their bright ſide, but drawn a Veil over their Faults and Failings. There appear no Examples of this kind in the ſecond Century, from any Eccleſiaſtical Writers that I know of; and therefore we may reaſonably conclude, that that Age was wholly free from this Corruption.

ADRIAN, I confeſs, (in his Letter preſerv'd by VOPISCUS, in the Life of SATURNINUS) charges the Chriſtians of *Alexandria* with worſhipping *Serapis*, and other Acts of Idolatry: But allowing that Letter to be genuine, which may be very juſtly queſtion'd, it can never be underſtood of the Orthodox Chriſtians. For my part, I underſtand it with BARONIUS of the *Gnoſticks*, who liv'd in that City, where BASILIDES had newly founded or revived that damnable Sect, (*Euſeb. Chron. Hiſt.* iv. 7.) whoſe Principles were never to ſuffer for any Religion, and therefore comply'd with all, (*Euſeb.* 36.) And tho in outward Appearance they made Profeſſion of Chriſtianity, yet 'tis plain by their Practice that at the bottom they thought all Religions alike. For which Reaſon JUSTIN MARTYR denies them to be *Chriſtians*, (*Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 253.) And ADRIAN's Character agrees perfectly well with the Doctrines and Actions of ſuch Miſcreants.

§ 20. HAVING fully made good what I undertook to prove, That many groſs Corruptions had crept very early into the

third Century, in which number I reckon the Practice of ſerving in the Army, I ſhall now conſider the laſt Objection you have offer'd againſt this Article, That 'tis very unaccountable that there ſhou'd be no Chriſtian Soldiers under ANTONINUS, tho in thirty Years after it cannot be deny'd but there were ſome. To this I anſwer, that if I cou'd aſſign no Reaſon for this ſudden Change, yet if I have prov'd the Fact by Authors of undoubted Credit, this Argument can never have any weight, unleſs you'll ſet up bare Probabilities in oppoſition to poſitive Proofs. But I have aſſign'd a very probable Reaſon for it, the long Toleration from ANTONINUS to SEVERUS, and illuſtrated it with parallel Inſtances from CYPRIAN and EUSEBIUS, who aſcribe the Growth of all Corruptions in the Church to the ſame Cauſes: Beſides, I have demonſtrated by many Examples, that the Chriſtians, in caſe their Principles wou'd have allow'd them to ſerve, were ſhut out of the Army under perſecuting Reigns; and you have neither thought fit to deny the Fact, nor offer one Syllable to diſprove the Conſequence I had drawn from it, except what has

has been already anſwer'd. But after all, why do you think this Alteration ſo very extraordinary? Are there no Precedents to be met with in Church Hiſtory of as ſudden turns in Points of far greater Importance? Did not the World almoſt univerſally, in a far ſhorter ſpace of Time, turn from Orthodoxy to *Arianiſm*? Did not the whole Body of the People of *England*, at the Reformation, in the compaſs of twelve Years, change their Religion three times? But to come nearer home to the preſent Age, han't we ſeen as quick turns, even of paſſive Principles, in our own Days, and in our own Country? In thoſe Inſtances I have produc'd, the Change was univerſal: But in the preſent Caſe 'twas only a corrupt Practice of ſome particular Perſons, condemn'd by the Fathers of that Age, and never warranted by the Authority of the Church, as I have ſhown at § 9. nor do the numbers of the Chriſtian Soldiers, at that time, appear to have been conſiderable. They ſeem moſt of them to have been converted in the Army; and a good part of them, upon their Converſion, quitted the Service, as we are aſſur'd by TERTULLIAN, (*de Coron. mil. c.* 11.)

And if you'll take ORIGEN's Word for it, in his Anſwer to CELSUS, which was written about the middle of the third Century, under the Emperor PHILIP, a known Favourer of Chriſtianity, there were then no Chriſtian Soldiers in the Army,. (*Origen contra Celſum*, p. 427.)

§ 21. THERE remains nothing of your Anſwer to examine, but your laſt Obſervation on this Article, That XIPHILIN is the only Writer who directly affirms that this Legion was intirely compos'd of Chriſtians. But does not NICEPHORUS almoſt as expreſly aſſert, and EUSEBIUS as plainly intimate, the ſame? And you will pardon me if I think you are the firſt Man who ever underſtood either of them in another Senſe. GREGORY NYSSEN makes the whole or the far greater part of the Legion to be Chriſtians. The other Authors indeed differ very widely from this Account. TERTULLIAN and the *Alexandrian* Chronicle ſay nothing like it: and OROSIUS and PAULUS DIACONUS expreſly contradict it, and ſay the Miracle was wrought by *rudis parvuſq; militum numerus*. And the Author

thor of ANTONINUS's forg'd Epiſtle ſays, they bore no Arms, and conſequently were no Soldiers: and their diſagreement in moſt other Particulars of this Story is very remarkable. ANTONINUS led his Army in Perſon, according to EUSEBIUS in his Hiſtory, and XIPHILIN: But the ſame EUSEBIUS, in his Chronicle, and the *Alexandrine* Chronicle, ſays he was abſent, and that the Army was commanded by PERTINAX. TERTULLIAN mentions nothing but a Shower of Rain, which refreſh'd the *Roman* Army; the reſt all tell you, that the Enemy's Army was defeated by a Storm of Thunder and Lightning, at the ſame time. And GREGORY NYSSEN differs from all the reſt, in almoſt every Article of his Relation. Here is a very hopeful Evidence ſumm'd up, and I'm miſtaken if a Jury wou'd find a Bill upon the Teſtimony of ſuch Witneſſes as vary'd in every Circumſtance of the Story. To me, I am ſure, the claſhing of the Chriſtian Writers, in ſo many material Heads of the Miracle, is a good Argument of the Impoſture of the whole: For 'tis a plain Proof that 'twas warranted by no authentick Memoirs of the Age in

which 'twas ſaid to happen, but built all upon common Fame and Tradition, the worſt Authorities in the World: Otherwiſe, all Writers muſt have concurr'd in every material Circumſtance of the Story. Truth is one, but Falſhood is infinite.

A Defence of the ſecond Article, That the Thundering Legion did not take its Name from this Miracle.

ALL the Advocates for the Miracle having given up the Article in debate as a Point never to be maintain'd, I took it for granted you wou'd not diſpute it; for which Reaſon I was very ſhort in my Arguments on that head: But ſince you are reſolv'd to take up the Cudgels in defence of APOLLINARIS, you will give me leave to examine the Reaſons you have produc'd, and to offer ſome new Arguments to make good my Charge againſt him.

§ 1. I FIND we are pretty well agreed that the *Legio Melitena* of EUSEBIUS,

BIUS, is a Chimerical Legion of his own Invention, and that he was led into this Error by miſtaking the name of the Place where it was quarter'd for the name of the Legion it ſelf. 'Tis very probable that DIO and EUSEBIUS mean the ſame Legion, *viz.* the 12*ma Fulminatrix*. DIO ſays, 'twas poſted in *Cappadocia*, in which Province *Melitene* lay. The *Notitia* and PROCOPIUS both place it at *Melitene*. The ſame Legion ſerv'd in *Armenia* under NERO, (*Tac. Ann.* XV. 6.) was from thence remov'd to *Syria*, and afterward imploy'd at the Siege of *Jeruſalem* under TITUS, (*Tac. Hiſt.* V. 1.) and 'tis very probable was one of the Legions added to *Cappadocia* by VESPASIAN, (*Suet. in Veſp.* 8.) where we are ſure 'twas quarter'd in DIO's time. But to ſet this matter beyond all diſpute, we have the expreſs Teſtimony of XIPHILIN, that DIO, in his Catalogue of the Legions, has mention'd this very wonder-working Legion: now 'tis plain he has mention'd no other *Legio Fulminatrix*, but the 12*ma* in *Cappadocia*, and which is conſequently the ſame with the *Melitenian* Legion of EUSEBIUS and XIPHILIN. All this you do not only grant,

but contend for; which is very ſtrange, ſince 'tis plainly giving up the Point in diſpute: For if the *Melitenian* Legion of EUSEBIUS be the very ſame with the 12*ma Fulminatrix* of DIO, 'tis moſt certain it cou'd not take its Name from this Miracle, ſince it had that Name under TRAJAN and AUGUSTUS, almoſt two Centuries before the Date of this Miracle.

§ 2. IN the next place, you inſiſt that there was another Legion of the ſame name; which if you cou'd prove, wou'd be no advantage to your Cauſe, ſince you own that the *Thundering Legion* of XIPHILIN and EUSEBIUS was the ſame with DIO's; which, you confeſs, had that name long before the Reign of ANTONINUS. But even in this I muſt beg leave to differ from you: There is no Fact, I know of in Hiſtory, more certain than that there was no other *Legio Fulminatrix* in the Reign of ANTONINUS, nor long after. DIO (*l.* lv. *p.* 564.) has given us a Liſt of all the Legions of AUGUSTUS, and all the new ones that were rais'd by the ſucceeding Emperors, as low as the Reign of SEVERUS ALEXANDER, where his Hiſtory ends. No other Le-

gion of that Name is mention'd by him, nor in the Itinerary of ANTONINUS, nor the *Notitia*. There appears no other *Legio Fulminatrix* in the Catalogue of the Legions preſerv'd in the *Inſcriptio Capitolina*, which is later than DIOCLESIAN, and has been publiſh'd by GRUTER, LIPSIUS, PANCIROLLUS, but moſt correctly of all by PATIN in his *Suetonius*, (*p.* 377.) nor in any other Inſcription or Medal now extant. From all which, 'tis as clear as the Sun, that there was no other Legion of that Name for the firſt three or four Centuries: And if you cou'd produce any other, it muſt have been rais'd long after the Reign of ANTONINUS, and cou'd do no manner of Service to your Cauſe.

§ 3. AS for your Argument from GOLTZIUS, you muſt pardon me if I think your Memory has deceiv'd you. The Criticks who have defended this Miracle, had all read GOLTZIUS; and if they had found ſuch a Medal in him, wou'd not have fail'd to urge it in behalf of their Cauſe. I am apt enough to believe that the ſame Legion may be mention'd in ſeveral Coins of GOLTZIUS, but

but not different Legions of the ſame Name. This Legion, you ſay, is fix'd at *Melitene* by the *Notitia*, with a particular note of Diſtinction; which implies there was another of that Name ſomewhere elſe. But what note of diſtinction is it mention'd with? Was it not the deſign of the *Notitia* to give a ſhort view of the civil and military Government of the Empire? And to this end, has it not ſet down the Places where all the Legions, Cohorts, and Squadrons were poſted? Are not the firſt and fifteenth Legions ſet down in the ſame Chapter, with the ſame notes of Diſtinction? And all the reſt of the Legions mention'd in the ſame manner, in other Parts of that Book? And may you not, by this way of arguing, double all the Squadrons and Legions in the *Notitia*?

§ 4. TO ſhow you all imaginable fair play, and to let you ſee that I contend for Truth, and not for Victory, I will for once furniſh you with a Paſſage of CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENNETUS, (in his Treatiſe, as I believe, *de Thematibus*) which may ſeem, at firſt ſight, to favour

your Opinion of two Thundering Legions. 'Tis cited by SCALIGER, in his *Thesaurus Temporum*, in these Words, ὡς ἡ λεγεὼν ἡ τῶν μ̄ μαρτύρων ἐκαλεῖτο κεραυνοβόλος καὶ ἄλλη Πισιδική; which I render thus, *Sicut Legio* 40 *martyrum Fulminatrix dicebatur, & alia Pisidica.* As for the Legion of the 40 Martyrs, we know from PROCOPIUS, as cited by PANCIROLLUS on the *Notitia*, that 'twas the same with the 12*ma Fulminatrix.* These 40 Martyrs suffer'd under LICINIUS: And you may read the History of their Martyrdom in a whole Homily of St. BASIL on that Subject, and the miraculous Discovery of their Reliques in SOZOMEN, (*l.* ix. *c.* 2.) all which I want Faith to believe: And I pity, from my heart, the hard Fate of this poor Legion, to be made the Subject of so many Ecclesiastical Legends. As for the *alia Pisidica*, I don't well know whether he means there was another Legion sirnam'd *Pisidica*, or another *Pisidian* Legion sirnam'd *Fulminatrix*; for the Words will bear both Senses. If the last Sense be the right one, you have a Voucher for two Thundering Legions. But this *Legio Pisidica Fulminatrix* is like the *Meli-*

Melitenian, unknown to all the Writers of the four firſt Centuries; and if there were ever any ſuch, it muſt have been either new rais'd, or new nam'd, under the *Byzantine* Emperors, and conſequently can do no manner of Service to your Cauſe. Beſides, you know how little ſtreſs is to be laid on the Authority of a Writer of the tenth Century. However, I deſire you to tranſcribe this Paſſage of CONSTANTINE at large, with what goes before and after, that I may be able to make a right Judgment of it. You will find it, I preſume, in the firſt Volume of the *Byzantine* Hiſtorians, with his *Excerptæ Legationes*, which, I think, you told me were in Canon FOULK's Library.

§ 5. I SHALL wind up this Article with a judicious Remark of VALESIUS on this Subject: He blames EUSEBIUS for citing neither the very Words nor the particular Treatiſe of APOLLINARIS, from whence he took this Relation; which looks like an Intimation, as if he queſtion'd the Accuracy of EUSEBIUS in this matter: and I think he had good Reaſon to

to ſuſpect it. EUSEBIUS (iv. 27.) owns that all the Works of APOLLINARIS, which came to his hands, were written before the Riſe of *Montaniſm*, and conſequently before this Miracle, except his Book againſt the *Montaniſts*, which was a very improper Place to relate this Miracle, the *Montaniſts* being indeed Hereticks but no Heathens: which makes me ſuſpect that EUSEBIUS took this Relation upon Tradition or Truſt, from ſome Perſons who pretended to have ſeen it in ſome Work of APOLLINARIS, which he never met with, and which perhaps was never extant, or was perhaps ſpurious. I am confirm'd in this Opinion by the ſilence of TERTULLIAN, and all the following Writers, (except XIPHILIN and NICEPHORUS, who copy from EUSEBIUS) who never wou'd otherwiſe have omitted ſo ſignal a Circumſtance of the Story, eſpecially when 'twas atteſted by an eminent Father, who liv'd in the very time when the Miracle was wrought. Beſides, 'tis the Cuſtom of EUSEBIUS, on moſt other Occaſions, to cite the very Words of his Author, as he has done TERTULLIAN's in this very Chapter; and

and thoſe Citations are the moſt valuable part of his Hiſtory. From all which, I am apt to think EUSEBIUS never ſaw this Book of APOLLINARIS, nor any body elſe; and therefore I am willing to acquit APOLLINARIS of my Charge againſt him, and fix it on the Negligence of EUSEBIUS.

A Defence of the third Article, That ANTONINUS *never aſcrib'd this Miracle to the Prayers of the Chriſtians.*

MY Argument in defence of this Article, from the ſilence of all the Heathen Hiſtorians, you anſwer by charging it on their Bigotry and Malice to the Chriſtians, and that they cou'd not own the Fact without believing Chriſtianity: But there appears no ſuch Paſſion and Prejudice in their Writings as you repreſent. TACITUS, tho a profeſt Enemy, clears them from the Guilt of burning *Rome*, (*Ann.* XV. 44.) And PLINY gives them a juſt and noble Character, in his celebrated Epiſtle, (X. 97.) And LUCIAN (*de morte Peregrini*)

grini) himſelf, tho he laughs at their Religion, does them ample Juſtice in owning their ſteadineſs to their Principles, their Charity and Bounty, with their other moral Virtues; and ſeems to treat them with Reſpect in his *Pſeudomantis*. They are never once nam'd with Reproach by DIO, or the ſix Writers of the *Hiſtoria Auguſta*, and frequently with Honour by MARCELLINUS. Nor were the Heathens oblig'd, by the Principles of their Religion, to reject all Chriſtian Miracles without Exception. Many of their Writers, as well as the *Jews*, acknowledg'd the Miracles of *Chriſt*, without being Converts to Chriſtianity; for the firſt aſcrib'd them to *Magick*, as the laſt did to *Beelzebub*. The Miracles under JULIAN and THEODOSIUS, are own'd with great Candor by MARCELLINUS and CLAUDIAN; and St. JEROM aſſures us, that even PORPHYRY and EUNOMIUS acknowledg'd the Miracles which were wrought at the Tombs of the Martyrs, (*vid. Huet. Dem.* p. 41.) And after all, this Argument proves too much, and may be turn'd directly upon you. For by the ſame Rule ANTONINUS cou'd not believe the

the Miracle, as you ſay he did, without turning Chriſtian, which we are ſure he did not. This Argument can never be anſwer'd upon your Principles: But I ſhall take no advantage of it, becauſe I think you are miſtaken in your Poſition, it being apparent from the Inſtances I have produc'd, that the Heathens might and did own ſome Miracles of the Chriſtians, without ſuch a Contradiction to their Principles as you ſuppoſe, and without the leaſt danger of turning Chriſtians. I intirely agree with you in what follows, that the Heathens never aſcrib'd any publick Benefit to the Chriſtians, as you prove from *Tertul. Apol.* c. 40. to which I may add another Paſſage in his Diſcourſe to SCAPULA, *c.* 4. On the contrary, 'tis certain in the main, that as long as Paganiſm prevail'd, they charg'd all the Miſeries and Misfortunes of the Empire on the Atheiſm and Impiety of the Chriſtians; and upon any publick Calamity the common Cry was, *Chriſtianos ad Leones.* This you confeſs, tho it intirely ruins your own Hypotheſis: For if this be true, how came ſuch a Bigot and Perſecutor as ANTONINUS to aſcribe this Victory to their

their Prayers? If he quitted his Bigotry on this occaſion, why, by the ſame parity of Reaſon, might not the Heathen Hiſtorians, who of all others, as I have prov'd, gave the faireſt quarter to the Chriſtians, have done them the ſame Juſtice? In ſuch a caſe, I think it as incredible as ever, that ſo many candid and impartial Writers ſhou'd all, with one conſent, conſpire to diſown ſo memorable an Event; which, as you ſay, gave a new Name to a Legion, was atteſted by ANTONINUS in his Letter to the Senate, and ſpread all the World over by the imperial Edicts in favour of the Chriſtians.

§ 2. AFTER you had flatly deny'd that the Heathen Writers, by the Principles of their Religion, cou'd ever yield the Chriſtians the Honour of this Miracle, you make them give it up by a ſide wind, in aſcribing it to the *Chaldeans*; by whom, you ſay, the Chriſtians were meant. And this you prove by the help of two very precarious Suppoſitions, that the Heathens confounded the Chriſtians with the *Jews*, and the *Jews* with the *Chaldeans*. As for the firſt, I am willing

to allow it in the firſt Riſe of Chriſtianity; becauſe the firſt Chriſtians were all *Jews:* But when our Religion had gain'd footing among the Heathens, they were well enough acquainted with the Diſtinction, as appears by their different Treatment of both. Sometimes the *Jews* were perſecuted, and not the Chriſtians, as under VESPASIAN, (*Euſeb. Eccl. Hiſt.* iii. 17.) At other times the Chriſtians, and not the *Jews*, as under TRAJAN, and the ANTONINI; and after the great Rebellion of the *Jews* under ADRIAN, when they ſo barbarouſly maſſacred the Chriſtians for refuſing to abjure their Religion, and bear Arms againſt the *Romans*, the Diſtinction grew notorious to all the World. From that time, the *Jews* were the moſt avow'd Enemies of the Chriſtians. 'Twas they gave riſe to thoſe villanous Reports which expos'd them to the Rage of the Heathens, (*Orig. contra Celſ.* lib. 6. p. 293, 4.) and were the moſt active Inſtruments in promoting all the ſucceeding Perſecutions, (*vid. Acta Polycarpi, & Euſeb.* v. 16.) All the Writers about this time well knew the Difference between them, as ADRIAN in his Letter, preſerv'd

by VOPISCUS, (*in Saturnino*) CELSUS, GALEN, and others. And I know of no Writer near the Age of ANTONINUS (for ARRIAN, ſo often cited on this occaſion, ſpeaks only of the *Jews* properly ſo call'd) that confounds them.

§ 3. THAT the *Jews* were ever ſtyl'd *Chaldeans* by the Heathens, I utterly deny: And HUETIUS, who firſt ſtarted this Argument, is miſtaken in every Inſtance he has produc'd to prove it. PHILO might not improperly call the *Hebrew* Language the *Chaldean*, becauſe 'twas a Dialect of it: But will he from thence infer that the *Jews* were call'd *Chaldeans*? By the ſame Rule the *Scots* might be call'd *Engliſh*. Beſides, PHILO was a *Jew*. The ſame Anſwer will ſerve to your Argument, from SOLOMON's Proverbs being call'd a *Chaldean* Book: For tho you han't nam'd your Authors, I'll venture to tell you before-hand, they were either *Jews* or Chriſtians. In his next Inſtance of the *Chaldean* Oracle, the *Jews* and *Chaldeans* are not confounded, but plainly diſtinguiſh'd, as STANLEY, LE CLERC, and every body elſe underſtands it. As

for the following Inſtance, the Paraphraſt of DIONYSIUS's *Periegeſis* does not there ſpeak of the *Jews*, but the *Phœnicians*; and 'tis probable, from the beginning and end of his Poem, that he was a Chriſtian. I never heard of ſuch an Oracle in PORPHYRY as you mention: But NICEPHORUS (i. 17.) and SUIDAS (in Αὐγουστος, *p.* 488.) tell us of an Oracle deliver'd to AUGUSTUS, (*me Puer Hebræus*, &c.) which had ſuch an Effect on the Emperor, that he forthwith erected an Altar with this Inſcription, *Ara primogeniti Dei*: which is an excellent Story, and fit to keep company with the *Thundering* and *Thebæan* Legions. 'Tis plain that none of theſe Inſtances prove what Mr. HUET contends for: nor can any good Reaſon be aſſign'd why the Heathens ſhou'd confound the *Jews* with the *Chaldeans*, unleſs they had thought them originally *Chaldeans*, which the far greater part of the Heathen Hiſtorians never acknowledg'd. STRABO, (*l.* xvi.) TACITUS, (*Hiſt.* 5.) CELSUS, (*l.* iii. *p.* 114.) DIODORUS SICULUS, (*l.* xxxiv. *Exlog.* 1.) CHÆREMON, LYSIMACHUS, APION, and APOLLONIUS, (*apud Joſeph.*

ſeph. contra Apion.) all derive them from the *Egyptians:* And 'tis probable that HERODOTUS, (*l.* ii.) and PLUTARCH, (*Sympoſ.* iv. 5.) were of the ſame Opinion. JUSTIN (*l* xxxvi.) fetches them from *Egypt* and *Damaſcus.* MANETHO, 'tis true, allows them not to be *Egyptians* originally, but plainly intimates that they were no *Chaldeans*, (*apud Joſeph.* ib.) TACITUS indeed ſays, that ſome deriv'd them from the *Aſſyrians*, &c. but his whole Relation is ſo agreeable in all its Circumſtances to the *Moſaick* Account, that I am perſuaded he took it from JOSEPHUS, whoſe Antiquities were newly publiſh'd, and not from any Heathen Authors; for otherwiſe JOSEPHUS wou'd never have fail'd to produce ſo ſtrong a Teſtimony againſt APION in vindication of his own Hiſtory. NICHOLAUS DAMASCENUS (who was either a *Jew* or a judaizing Heathen) does indeed make ABRAHAM a *Chaldean*, and if I miſtake not, ALEXANDER; *Poly-Hiſtor.* But their Authority was never follow'd or regarded by the Current of the Heathen Hiſtorians.

§ 4. BUT ſhou'd I allow you that the *Jewiſh* and *Chaldean* Nations were ſometimes confounded by the Heathens, what Advantage cou'd you gain by this Conceſſion? For LAMPRIDIUS and CLAUDIAN, by *Chaldeans* don't mean the Name of a Nation, but a Sect of judiciary Aſtrologers which had its firſt Riſe in *Chaldea*; and from thence by degrees, in after Ages, the Name was apply'd indifferently to Aſtrologers of all Nations whatſoever. Thus all *Proſelytes* to the *Jewiſh* Religion were ſtyl'd *Jews* by the Heathens, (*Dio* xxxvii. p. 37.) and all *Pagans* were call'd *Greeks* by the primitive Chriſtians; and all *Magicians* and *Necromancers Magi*, from the *Magi* of the *Eaſt*, where the Sect firſt began. And even to this day, all our ſtrolling Fortune-tellers are call'd *Gypſies*, or *Egyptians*, whoſe Poſterity they falſly pretend to be, (*Camerar. Horæ Subſic.* i. 17.) That all Aſtrologers were indifferently call'd *Chaldeans*, appears from A. GELL. (xiv. i.) *Qui ſeſe Chaldæos, ſeu Genethliacos appellant:* And a little lower he plainly diſtinguiſhes the original *Chaldeans* from thoſe of his own Age; from

JUVE

JUVENAL, (*Sat.* 10.)—*Caprearum in rupe ſedenti cum grege Chaldæo* ; *i. e.* ſays the old *Scholiaſt*, *Magi & Mathematici* : and SULPICIUS SEVERUS, (*l.* i. *c.* 14.) ſtyles the *Egyptian Magicians*, *Chaldeans*. To confirm this, TACITUS (*Ann.* iv. 58.) ſays, moſt of TIBERIUS's Companions at *Capreæ* were *Greeks* ; and THRASYLLUS's chief Conjurer was an *Egyptian Greek* of *Mendes*. The ſame may be inferr'd from CICERO, (*de Divinat.* i. 1.) when he ſpeaks of the *Chaldeans* properly ſo call'd, *Non ex Artis, ſed ex Gentis vocabulo nominati* ; which implies it was the Name of a Sect as well as of a Nation. The *Mathematici* and *Chaldæi* are confounded by SUET. (*in Vitell.* c. 14.) and by ANTONINUS, (*l.* iii. *c.* 3. *l.* iv. *c.* 30.) And even ARNUPHIS, to whom DIO attributes the Miracle, was an *Egyptian Greek*. BEROSUS firſt brought the *Chaldean* Learning into *Greece*, (*Vitruv.* ix. 7. *p.* 196. *Joſeph. contra Apion. lib.* i.) where it quickly took root, and from thence it paſs'd into *Italy*. And I make no doubt but that the *Chaldæi* and *Mathematici*, ſo often mention'd in the

Roman Story, were (except ſome few *Romans*) all *Grecians*.

§ 5. IN the ſenſe you have given to CLAUDIAN's Verſes, you have offer'd the greateſt Violence imaginable to the plain and natural Meaning of the Words. Can any thing be more obvious, than that he there ſpeaks of the magical Charms of the Heathens, and not of Chriſtian Hymns and Prayers? Do not DIO, and the nameleſs Authors cited by SUIDAS (*in Arnuphim & Julianum*) who are the beſt Comments on CLAUDIAN, make the Miracle wrought by the Invocation of the Heathen Gods? Don't they name the very *Magicians* concern'd in it, ARNUPHIS and JULIANUS? And were they not both *Pagans*? By this way of interpreting Authors, I'll maintain the wildeſt Paradox in the World, and prove with as good Reaſon that ANTONINUS was *Pope* of *Rome*, becauſe he was PONTIFEX MAXIMUS. But that theſe Authors are not to be underſtood in your ſenſe, is manifeſt from EUSEBIUS, who expreſly declares that all the Heathen Writers deny'd the Chriſtians the Honour of this Miracle; which

which he had never ſaid, if there had been the leaſt Colour or Pretence to interpret DIO, LAMPRIDIUS, or any of them from whom CLAUDIAN took his Account, in favour of the Chriſtians.

§ 6. I DON'T ſee what Advantage you can draw to your Cauſe from ANTONINUS's Letter to the Senate. Was it unuſual for the Emperors to write Letters to the Senate? Do you think that any Emperor ever won a Victory, without acquainting the Senate with it? And what elſe was the Subject of this Letter, but an Account of his Victory, with an Apology to the Senate for accepting the Title of *Imperator*, without conſulting them? But is there the leaſt hint or intimation in DIO, that this Letter aſcrib'd the Victory to the Chriſtians? The Preſumption is much ſtronger on t'other ſide; for if ANTONINUS had imputed this Victory to the Chriſtians in his Letter, how came DIO to give it to ARNUPHIS and the Heathen Gods? Ignorant of the Contents of the Letter he cou'd not be; for he was a Senator under COMMODUS, and had free Acceſs to their Journals. His Sincerity

rity can't well be ſuſpected, having never ſhewn the leaſt Malice or Prejudice to the Chriſtians in the whole courſe of his Hiſtory.

§ 7. IN the next place, you try to invalidate the Teſtimony of the Heathen Hiſtorians, by ſhewing, from ANTONINUS's own Writings, how mean an Opinion he entertain'd of Wizards and Conjurers. But this, I crave leave to tell you, is another of your Arguments that proves too much: For if this Paſſage in his Works, as you ſeem to underſtand it, is level'd without diſtinction at all Exorciſts and Pretenders to Miracles, the Chriſtians, as well as the *Jews* and Heathens, muſt be included in that number; and I am perſuaded that, like LUCIAN in the *Philopſeudes*, he had the Chriſtians chiefly in view, when I conſider the Severity with which he treated them, and the conſtant Scorn and Contempt which, thro' a fatal Blindneſs, he expreſs'd for them to the very laſt, as I ſhall ſhow at large in my defence of the following *Article*. So that this Argument concludes as ſtrongly againſt his believing a Chriſtian as a Heathen

then Miracle. MERICK CASAUBON makes this Reflection not to extend in general againſt theſe Arts and Profeſſions, but only againſt the Abuſe of them by Cheats and Impoſtures; which, after all, is the moſt probable Opinion: For otherwiſe the Principles and Practice of ANTONINUS can never be reconcil'd. 'Tis certain, he conſulted the *Chaldeans* upon ſome Occaſions; of which we have a remarkable Inſtance in *Capitol.* c. 19. And he mentions them in other parts of his Works without any marks of Reproach, (*l.* iii. *c.* 3. *l.* iv. *c.* 30.) When the Peſtilence rag'd ſo dreadfully in the Empire, after the ordinary Remedies had fail'd, he made no ſcruple to have recourſe to foreign Rites and Ceremonies, (*Capitol. c.* 13.) by which, I believe, are meant magical Sacrifices and Luſtrations, with Charms and Spells, as is probable from LUCIAN's *Pſeudomantis*. But the moſt ſignal Inſtance of his Credulity in this kind, is his obeying the Directions of the Oracle, deliver'd by ALEXANDER, that notorious Cheat, (*Lucian Pſeudomant.*) And I ſee no reaſon why, in ſuch a preſſing Extremity, he might not as well have recourſe

courſe to the Charms of the *Magicians*, as to the Oracle of ſuch an infamous Impoſtor on another occaſion.

§ 8. IN the next place, I ſhall vindicate the Authority of the Pillar and the Medal, from the Objections you have rais'd againſt them. I can ſee no Contradiction, as you objected to me at *Exeter*, between the Pillar and the Medal, tho one attributes the Victory to JUPITER, and the other to MERCURY. Do you think, that in ſuch a multitude of Pagan Gods, the ſame Event may not be aſcrib'd to more Gods than one? of which Examples without number might be produc'd. Does not DIO, our beſt Guide, affirm that this Miracle was wrought by the Interpoſition of MERCURY *and other Gods*? of which number, 'tis probable, JUPITER was one. 'Tis well known that JUPITER, with all his Thunder, might be drawn down by the force of Inchantments, *Sacris quibuſdam, & imprecationibus Fulmen cogi*, (Plin. Hiſt. Nat. ii. 53. xxviii. 2.) and from thence he took the Sirname of ELICIUS, (*Plin.* ib. *Liv.* i. 20. *Ovid. Faſt.* iii. *v.* 327.) This alone

alone wou'd be a full Anſwer to your Objection; but I'll offer you a fairer Solution of this pretended Difficulty. MERCURY was here eſteem'd as the miniſterial and ſecondary God; while JUPITER, as the great Ruler of the World, was conſider'd as the chief and primary Agent in this Miracle. The *Mercurius Aerius* of DIO is the ſame with the *Mercurius Supremus* of SERVIUS, (*ad Virg. Æn.* 4. *v.* 574.) who executed the Commands of JUPITER in the Air, *Deus æthere miſſus ab alto*, (Virg. ib.) *Fert horrida juſſa ſub auras*, (ib. *v.* 356, 378.) *Juſſa per auras verba patris porto*, (Ov. Met. 2. *v.* 743.) MERCURY, we all know, was JUPITER's Miniſter, (*Lucian Dial. inter Maiam & Merc.*) And from thence he is ſtyl'd *Miniſtrator* in the Inſcriptions, and was the propereſt God to be imploy'd on this occaſion; becauſe he was a magical God, (*Pruden. contra Symmach. Apuleii Apol.*) and preſided over the Sphere of Water, (*Macr. in Somn. Scip.* i. 11.) This Notion is agreeable not only to the philoſophical, but even to the popular Syſtem of the Pagan Theology, as is apparent from PLAUTUS in his Prologue

to

to *Amphitryon*, *v.* 40. *&c.* There you ſee that all the Benefits the Heathens receiv'd by the immediate Miniſtry of MERCURY, and their other ſubordinate Gods, were aſcrib'd to JUPITER as the remote and ſupreme Cauſe. And the ſame is confirm'd by TERTULLIAN in his *Apology*, c. 24.

§ 9. I HAD urg'd the Authority of the Pillar and the Medal, to prove that ANTONINUS did not aſcribe this Victory to the Chriſtians. To evade the force of this Argument, you make both theſe Monuments to be pure Acts of the Senate, on purpoſe to rob the Chriſtians of the Glory of this Deliverance. But this wou'd have been a very ſorry Expedient to ſtifle the Memory of a Miracle, which had been already publiſh'd all the World over by the ſirname of a Legion, and the Emperor's Letter and Edicts, which were all ſufficient Memorials to preſerve it upon Record. But how do you prove that the Medal was ſtruck by order of the Senate? There appears nothing like it in three Deſcriptions of the Medal in SPANHEIM, WALKER, and PAGI; and there-

therefore I muſt take it for granted, that 'twas ſtamp'd, like moſt other publick Medals, by the Emperor's Direction. The Date and Inſcription of the Pillar I have forgot, and ſhall take it upon your Credit to have been erected by order of the Senate. From whence you infer, that ANTONINUS had no hand in it; which is a very wrong Concluſion: For the Emperor's Conſent was virtually included in every Vote of the Senate, as much as the Queen's in an Act of Parliament. As *Princeps Senatûs*, he was a Member of the Senate; and by virtue of his Tribunitian Power he had a negative Vote, (*Dio lib.* liii. *p.* 508.) and nothing cou'd paſs the Houſe without his Concurrence and Approbation. Do you think theſe *Homines in Servitutem nati*, as TIBERIUS juſtly ſtyl'd them, wou'd have openly flown in the Emperor's Face, and given his Letter the lye? To believe them capable of ſo bold a ſtep, one muſt have a very wrong Idea of the abſolute Power of the Emperors, and of that Submiſſion and Obedience without reſerve, which the Senate always paid them. Perhaps you'll preſs me with the Example

of

of the Senate's refuſing to concur with TIBERIUS, in enacting Divine Honours to Chriſt, becauſe the Emperor himſelf had declin'd them. This is another of TERTULLIAN's Fables. But allowing it to be true, was it poſſible for the Senate to make a higher Complement to their Prince? Flattery is never ſo artful and refin'd as when it carries an Appearance of Liberty. And this new way of making their court to the Emperor was found out by the Senate of that Age, when all the old Topicks were grown ſtale; *Ea ſola Species adulandi ſupererat*, ſays TACITUS, (*Ann.* i. 8.) I need not obſerve to you how wide a Difference there is between theſe two Caſes. But you alledge, that this Pillar was owing to the Bigotry of the Senate, and their Malice to the Chriſtians. But I muſt crave leave to tell you, that even this is a very improbable Conjecture. 'Tis well known that CONSTANTINE *the Great* cou'd influence the Heathen Senate, and People of *Rome*, to erect a triumphal Arch, ſtill extant, in memory of his Victory over MAXENTIUS, with an Inſcription, owning that he

he had reſcu'd the Empire *inſtinctu Divinitatis*; which is a manifeſt Alluſion to the miraculous Viſion which appear'd to him, as he pretended, before the Battle. Not that the Senate believ'd a Syllable of the matter: For what Opinion the Heathens entertain'd of this Viſion is apparent from ZOSIMUS, (*lib.* ii.) Yet nevertheleſs, they made no ſcruple to pay the Emperor this Compliment. Do you think the Senate of CONSTANTINE paid him more Reverence and Reſpect, who had two Heathen Sharers in the Empire, than ANTONINUS's Senate paid him, who was abſolute Maſter of the whole Empire? Can you ſuppoſe the Senate, at that juncture, ſhow'd leſs Zeal for their Religion, when 'twas in manifeſt Hazard of Ruin, than under ANTONINUS, when there was no ſuch Danger in view? In ſhort, the Senate always fear'd their Emperors more than their Gods, and wou'd have voted the Honour of the Miracle to any God, or Religion, ANTONINUS had bid them. From what I have now ſaid, it ſeems very plain that ANTONINUS and the Senate acted in concert, in this matter, and both join'd in aſcribing this Victory to their

own Gods, as appears by the Authority of two publick Monuments, which are the beſt and moſt undoubted Vouchers for the Truth of any antient Fact, and can never lye in miſrepreſenting the declar'd and avow'd Senſe and Opinion of thoſe who ſet them up; and conſequently ANTONINUS never attributed it to the Chriſtians, as TERTULLIAN pretends: For 'tis impoſſible both theſe Accounts can be true, unleſs you ſuppoſe the moſt extravagant thing in the World, that ANTONINUS was capable of acting ſo mean and inconſiſtent a part, and ſo unworthy of his Character, as to ſet up publick Monuments in downright Contradiction to his own Letter and Declarations. 'Tis as great a Paradox to ſuppoſe that he divided the Honour of the Miracle between two Religions, which were as oppoſite as Heaven and Hell, the Truth of one neceſſarily ſuppoſing the Falſhood of the other. The Queen might as well appoint a Thankſgiving to Chriſt and Mahomet for the Victory of *Mons*. And what can be oppos'd to all theſe invincible Difficulties and Contradictions but the Authority of ſuch a credulous Enthuſiaſt as

TER-

TERTULLIAN, who was far gone in the Hereſy of MONTANUS before he wrote his *Apology*, as I ſhall prove under its proper Head in defence of *Article* V.

P. S. THAT Paſſage of PHILO which I have conſider'd § 3. is beſt explain'd by Dr. ALLIX, in his Letter publiſh'd in SPANHEIM's Treatiſe, *De præſt. Numiſmat.* p. 72. *Ed. Lond. Duplex fuit apud Judæos Character, unus ſacer, quo libri ſacri conſcribebantur. Ille magis ad Chaldaicum characterem acceſſit quàm Samaritanus, unde etiam videtur Philo,* lib. ii. *de vita Moſis, legem Chaldaicè ſcriptam aſſerere.*

A Defence of the fourth Article,

That ANTONINUS, *after this Deliverance, never publiſh'd any Edict in favour of the Chriſtians.*

'TIS a very good Argument that there never was any ſuch Edict publiſh'd, becauſe no Writer, near the Age of the Miracle, ſays a Word of it: For

TERTULLIAN's Edict is no other than that of M. ANTONINUS, and not his Father's, as you ſuppoſe, *ad Communitatem Aſiæ*. That Sentence of TERTULLIAN, where he mentions the Edict, (*Apol.* 5.) has no Relation or Dependance on the preceding one. His Deſign is to ſhew that the Chriſtians were only perſecuted by the bad Emperors, and favour'd by the good; of which he gives two Inſtances in ANTONINUS, the firſt in his owning the Miracle wrought by their Prayers; and the next in the Edict he publiſh'd in their favour. But it does not appear either from him, or his Tranſlator EUSEBIUS, that the Edict was the Conſequence of the Miracle; the contrary manifeſtly appears from all the following Writers, who, 'tis plain, never underſtood him in that Senſe: For not one of them, tho all make mention of ANTONINUS's Letter to the Senate, (as SCALIGER rightly obſerves) wherein he aſcribes the Victory to their Prayers, ſay a Syllable of any Edict in their favour: nor do any of them pretend that the Chriſtians had the leaſt Benefit by the Miracle, (vid. *Oroſium*, *Alex. Chron. Euſeb. Chron. Hiſtor. Miſcell.*) Nor does

does APOLLINARIS, who liv'd when the Miracle was wrought, give the leaſt hint of an Edict, either as he is cited by EUSEBIUS, or more largely by NICEPHORUS, tho he makes the Emperor attribute the Victory to the Chriſtians. From the ſilence of all theſe Writers, and the exact Agreement of TERTULLIAN's Edict, with that of ANTONINUS, (*ad Comm. Aſiæ*) for by both the Chriſtian was to be acquitted, and the Informer puniſh'd, one may reaſonably conclude that theſe Edicts were the ſame. I expect to hear you charge me with advancing new and unheard-of Paradoxes; and 'tis well I have ſo good a Second as VALESIUS on my ſide, (*ad Euſeb. lib.* v. *c.* 5, 21.) He there tells you, that TERTULLIAN's Edict, and this of ANTONINUS, are all one. And 'tis plain he cou'd not think it had any Reference to the Miracle, becauſe he fixes the Edict to the firſt Year of ANTONINUS, (*ad Euſeb.* iv. 13.) and the Miracle to the fourteenth, (*ad Euſeb.* v. 5.) which ſhows he underſtood TERTULLIAN in the ſame ſenſe I do. As for ANTONINUS's Letter, which gives the Honour of this Deliverance to the Chriſ-

tians, not a man of all the Writers who mention it, pretends to have ſeen it; not even TERTULLIAN, as his own Words manifeſtly imply. Is it not very extraordinary that this Letter ſhou'd have the ill-luck to eſcape the Curioſity of ſo many Authors, who were concern'd in Intereſt to have found out and preſerv'd ſo illuſtrious a Teſtimony againſt the Heathens? How came EUSEBIUS to miſs it, who, with ſuch Care and Induſtry, has collected all the original Monuments of thoſe Ages, relating to the Church? This Argument, as I had urg'd it in my former Diſcourſe, very well deſerv'd an Anſwer, if it wou'd have born one. As for the Edict, the firſt Writer I know of who mentions it, is the Author of the ſpurious Letter at the end of JUSTIN's *Apology*, who liv'd, as SCALIGER gueſſes by his Style, about the Age of JUSTINIAN. I confeſs that he underſtood TERTULLIAN in your ſenſe; and upon this miſtaken Authority, has jumbled together the Letter and the Edict, and confounded two Events which were ſo many Years aſunder. And XIPHILIN, who wrote in the eleventh Century, might borrow this Circumſtance

of the Story from him. This Edict, which I preſume you allow to be ſpurious, is a good Argument that there never was a true one; for then there had been no need of a forg'd one. 'Tis in vain to ſay it was loſt: 'Tis in a manner impoſſible that ſo ſignal an Edict cou'd be loſt, when ſo many others, of far leſs Importance, are ſtill extant. You may almoſt as well ſuppoſe, that twenty Years hence not one Copy of the *Toleration-Act* ſhou'd be leſt in *England*.

§ 2. BUT tho you are not pleas'd to give any Account how this Edict came to be loſt, you are very certain that there was ſuch an one publiſh'd; becauſe, you ſay, it took effect in the Puniſhment of APOLLONIUS's Accuſer. But how does that appear? Mr. DODWELL (*de paucit. Mart. ſub Commodo*) is of opinion, that this Accuſer ſuffer'd by virtue of ADRIAN's Reſcript to FUNDANUS, without dreaming of this Chimerical Edict. no more than HUETIUS and VALESIUS, who think the Informer was puniſh'd purſuant to ANTONINUS's Edict, *ad Comm. Aſiæ*. And as for their Reaſons, I leave

you to examine them. EUSEBIUS ſays, 'twas Κατὰ βασιλικὸν ὅρον, *ex Edicto Imperatoris.* And ſince no Emperor is nam'd, it ought, in common Conſtruction, to be underſtood of a Law made in favour of the Chriſtians, by the Emperor then reigning, COMMODUS: and this appears to me to be the true and natural Meaning of this Paſſage. 'Tis evident that the Puniſhment of this Informer cou'd never be founded on TERTULLIAN's Edict: For by that Law the Informer only was to be puniſh'd, and the Chriſtian to be diſcharg'd; which happen'd quite otherwiſe in the Caſe of APOLLONIUS. I ſpeak this upon ſuppoſition that PAMELIUS's Reading is the right one, which I take for granted; becauſe 'tis moſt agreeable to all the old Editions, to the Manuſcripts, and to common Senſe, to which RIGALTIUS's Reading can never be reconcil'd. And that this was the Reading of all the old Copies, appears from its agreeing ſo exactly with the ſpurious Edict father'd on ANTONINUS, by an Impoſtor of the ſixth Century, who, in all likelihood, as I obſerv'd before, drew the Plan of his Forgery from this Paſſage of TERTULLIAN,

LIAN, whoſe Apology was tranſlated into *Greek* long before, (*Euſeb.* ii. 2.) So that this Accuſer cou'd never ſuffer by virtue of this Edict; yet nevertheleſs, tho the Story of APOLLONIUS be foreignto the Buſineſs in hand, I will, for once, go out of the way to examine the Authority of that whole Relation; which appears to me very romantick, and can never be true in all its Circumſtances. And I am the more willing to make this Digreſſion, becauſe the chief Arguments I ſhall urge againſt it will conclude as ſtrongly againſt the Reading of RIGALTIUS. VALESIUS was very ſenſible of the Difficulties and Inconſiſtences which occur'd in this Story, as well as in that of the *Thundering Legion*, and has given broad hints of his opinion of both, but durſt not ſpeak out, becauſe the Church of *Rome* never parts with a *Miracle*, or a *Martyr*.

§ 3. IN the firſt place, there never was ſince the Creation of the World, ſuch a monſtrous Abſurdity ever enacted by any Lawgiver in his Wits, as to make it Death for any Informer whatſoever to accuſe and convict a Man of a Crime, which

was

was Death by the known Laws of the Land to commit. If to be a Chriſtian was ſo unpardonable an Offence, why, in the name of wonder, was it made criminal to accuſe them? If 'twas no Crime, why were they puniſh'd with Death? And wherefore were not the penal Laws againſt them repeal'd? But, ſays EUSEBIUS, it was enacted by an antient Law, that no Chriſtian Convict ſhou'd eſcape Puniſhment, unleſs he renounc'd his Religion. But this is falſe in fact, as appears from the Practice of all the Emperors, from the firſt Perſecution down to the Reign of COMMODUS. DOMITIAN reſtor'd all the Chriſtian Exiles, (*Tertull. Apol.* 5.) and NERVA acquitted all that were accus'd of Chriſtianity, (ἐπ' ἀσεβείᾳ, *Dio* p. 769.) And TRAJAN exempted them from Puniſhment, if his Reſcript to TIBERIAN be genuine, (vid. *Malelam.* p. 356. *Suidam in Trajano.*) Does not ADRIAN's Reſcript to FUNDANUS direct, that all Chriſtians upon their Tryal, unleſs convicted of ſome Crime againſt the State, ſhou'd be diſcharg'd, (*Euſeb. Hiſt.* iv. 9. and *Chron.*) And does not M. ANTONINUS's Edict (*ad Comm. Aſiæ*) enact the ſame

ſame in expreſs Words? Not to mention ſeveral other Reſcripts of ANTONINUS PIUS, all to the ſame purpoſe, in confirmation of ADRIANUS, as they are cited by MELITO in his *Apology*, (*Euſeb.* iv. 26.) And under all Perſecutions there were great numbers of Confeſſors, who were never Martyrs. Now if this Law was ſo ſacred and fundamental a part of the Government as never to be broken in upon, how came it that ſo many wiſe and moderate Princes, who were moſt of them Enemies to Chriſtianity, and affected the Glory of governing by Law, made no ſcruple to ſuperſede it? and that ſo lawleſs and arbitrary a Prince as COMMODUS, and ſo known a Favourer of the Chriſtians, ſhou'd be ſo tender of the Conſtitution, as not to exert his abſolute Power in diſpenſing with it, eſpecially when his chief Miniſter and Governor PERENIUS ſhow'd ſo much Inclination to have ſav'd APOLLONIUS. But I can never think there was ſuch a general Law as EUSEBIUS mentions, made either by TRAJAN, as VALESIUS ſuppoſes, or by any of his Predeceſſors: And if there ever had been ſuch a Law in force, it was

was repeal'd over and over by the Edicts of his Succeſſors, long before the Reign of COMMODUS. Another Circumſtance of this Story ſeems very extraordinary, that there cou'd be found any Perſon ſo void of common Senſe as to accuſe a Chriſtian for his Religion, when he was ſure of meeting a certain Death for his Reward: There are ſome other Inconſiſtencies in this Relation, which VALESIUS has taken notice of, and pretended to offer a Salvo for in his Notes, to which I refer you. As for the Difficulties I have touch'd upon, they appear to me ſo very weighty, that I cannot get over them; and if you will not allow them to affect the main Subſtance of the Story, you muſt give me leave to think that they intirely deſtroy the Credibility of theſe two Circumſtances, upon which your Argument is founded.

§ 4. IN the next place, I ſhall conſider more fully the Edict mention'd by TERTULLIAN, which I take to be no other than the Reſcript *ad Comm. Aſiæ*, or the general Aſſembly of the *Proconſular Aſia*, to which the chief Cities ſent their De-

Deputies, to conſult of their publick Games and Solemnities, in honour of the Emperors. This Edict is ſtill extant in EUSEBIUS, (*l.* iv. *c.* 13.) tho it was not publiſh'd, as he pretends, by ANTONINUS PIUS, but by MARK ANTONINUS, as the Title and Date of the Edict manifeſtly ſhow. SCALIGER firſt diſcover'd this Blunder of EUSEBIUS, and has been follow'd by HUETIUS, PEARSON, DODWELL, VALESIUS, PAGI, and the reſt of the modern Criticks, who all agree in aſcribing it to M. ANTONINUS, for Reaſons that can never be anſwer'd. It bears date in the fifteenth Year of his Tribunitian Power, which is coincident with the firſt of his Reign, as appears from the Medals, none of which exceed the thirty fourth Year of his *Trib. Pot.* which ſhows 'twas the laſt Year of his Reign, *A.C.* 180. and conſequently his firſt *Trib. Pot.* began *A. C.* 147. and his fifteenth *A. C.* 161. which was the firſt of his Reign. The ſame is confirm'd by CAPITOL. (*in Anton. c.* 6.) who ſays he had the Tribunitian Power conferr'd on him by ANTONINUS PIUS, at the Birth of his eldeſt Daughter, who was marry'd to VERUS about

ſeventeen Years after, in the ſecond or third Year of his Reign. This *Epocha* of his Tribunitian Power is confirm'd by ſo many other Synchroniſms, and concurrent Teſtimonies from Medals and Inſcriptions, that I am ſurpriz'd to ſee ſo great a Critick as Biſhop PEARSON (*Vind. Ignat. p.* 2, 162.) fix this Edict to the fifteenth Year of his Reign: At which rate he muſt connect the firſt Year of his Tribunitian Power with the firſt Year of his Reign; which can never be true, for the Reaſons already alledg'd. But this is only a Miſtake of that great Man, thro Haſte or Inadvertency, in which no body has thought fit to follow him. I will not give my ſelf the trouble to tranſcribe the Reaſons which induc'd the modern Criticks to aſſign this Edict to M. ANTONINUS, contrary to the Authority of EUSEBIUS. You may find them in PAGI and VALESIUS, who will give you ample Satisfaction on that head. Nor will I repeat the Arguments I have already urg'd, to prove it the ſame with TERTULLIAN's Edict. I am not ignorant that the Authority even of this Edict may be juſtly queſtion'd; but be it true or falſe, 'tis undoubtedly very

very antient: otherwiſe EUSEBIUS had never inſerted it into his Hiſtory. And I ſee no Reaſon, allowing it to be a Forgery, why it might not as well impoſe upon TERTULLIAN as upon him. To ſum up this long Argument in few Words, I have made it very probable that this Edict is the ſame with TERTULLIAN's. I have prov'd PAMELIUS's Reading to be the true one, and ruin'd the Credit of thoſe Circumſtances in the Story of APOLLONIUS, on which your Argument is founded: And if I am right in either of thoſe three Points, your whole Argument falls to the ground of courſe. I ſhall now paſs on to a Vindication of my Arguments, to prove that ANTONINUS perſecuted the Chriſtians after the Date of this Miracle, from the Objections you have rais'd againſt them, and offer ſome new Proofs to make good my Aſſertion.

§ 5. You ſuppoſe, upon the Authority of Biſhop LLOYD and Mr. DODWELL, that the Perſecution of *Lyons* broke out *A. C.* 167, and not 177, as I had fix'd it on the Credit of EUSEBIUS's Hiſtory. Their Argument from the *Annus Agonalis* of the *Ludi*

Ludi Lugdunenſes, which, I own, upon their Hypotheſis, can never be coincident with the Year 177, labours under this great Difficulty, that neither of them has offer'd one Syllable to prove thoſe Games to have been *Quinquennial*, beſides a bare *probabile eſt*, which is a very indifferent Proof. And unleſs that Point be thorowly eſtabliſh'd, the Argument has no manner of weight in it. PAGI, in his Reply, has offer'd ſeveral Reaſons to prove theſe Games annual, which I need not tranſcribe, (tho I think them for the moſt part very cogent and concluſive) becauſe you have the Book by you: He has likewiſe referr'd the Reader to A. B. DE MARCA's Book, *De Primatu Lugdunenſi*, who has defended the ſame Cauſe, which Book I never ſaw. The *Chron. Euſeb.* as explain'd by PAGI and PEARSON, (*Vind. Ignat.* p. 2, 160.) does not contradict his Hiſtory; and if it did, the Authority of the Hiſtory ought to be preferr'd, becauſe 'twas laſt written. To prove this Perſecution not to have happen'd *A. C.* 167, I ſhall only inſiſt upon two Arguments of Biſhop PEARSON, (*Vind. Ignat.* ib.) which are both drawn from the Letter of the Con-

Confeſſors of *Lyons*, juſt before their Martyrdom, to Pope ELEUTHERIUS, concerning the Hereſy of MONTANUS: which plainly ſhows, that this Perſecution was under Pope ELEUTHERIUS, and after the riſe of *Montaniſm*; in which are two notes of Time that can never agree to that Year.

§ 6. THAT ELEUTHERIUS was not Pope in the Year 167, is confirm'd by the Authority of all the antient *Greek* and *Latin* Writers, to a Man; and never contradicted by any one till EUTYCHIUS aroſe, an *Arabian* Writer of the tenth Century, who betrays ſuch Ignorance in the whole Courſe of his Hiſtory, that I am ſurpriz'd to ſee ſuch a Critick as Mr. DODWELL prefer his Authority to all the old Writers of the Church. If they were miſtaken in their Chronology, how came ſo late a Writer by a better Light? If he was ſo exact in his Hiſtory of the Church of *Rome*, why do Mr. DODWELL and his Friends reject his Authority, in his Accounts of the Government, and Diſcipline of his own See, which he had beſt Reaſon to be well inform'd of? But that's

a *Noli me tangere*. Biſhop PEARSON has given a juſt Character of this Patriarch in his *Vindic. Ignat.* (*p.* 1, 173.) and in his Poſthumous Works, (*p.* 141.) tho there, to ſerve a turn, he has follow'd his Authority too much; and yet, in fixing the Age of SOTER and ELEUTHERIUS, he has thought fit to diſcard him, and ſtick to the old *Latin* Accounts, (*vid.* *p.* 34.) For my part, I entertain the ſame Opinion of his Hiſtory; which, upon no occaſion, can deſerve the leaſt Reſpect or Credit, much leſs will I reject the Teſtimony of all the old Authors upon the Authority of ſo late and lying a Writer.

§ 7. MY next Argument is drawn from the *Montaniſts* being mention'd in the Letter of the Confeſſors to Pope ELEUTHERIUS; which is a plain Proof the Perſecution was after the Year 167, becauſe that Hereſy was not then in being, as we are aſſur'd by EUSEBIUS in his *Chronicon*, who fixes the firſt riſe of it to the Year 171. Biſhop PEARSON, in his *Vind. Ignatianæ*, eſpous'd this Opinion, but has thought fit to retract it in his Poſthumous Works, *p.* 214. for Reaſons that are

very obvious. DAILLE's Argument from the Σιγὴ of VALENTINUS, bore very hard on the Epiſtles of IGNATIUS; and to evade this Difficulty, the Biſhop was forc'd to thruſt back, by head and ſhoulders, the riſe of that Sect, and all the other Hereſies of thoſe Times, to make VALENTINUS and IGNATIUS Contemporaries. Mr. DODWELL aſſures us that he wrote this whole Book with no other view; and his being ſo ſtrongly biaſs'd by the Cauſe he was then maintaining, is a fair Account for the change of his Opinion.

I SHALL next examine his Reaſons. His Argument drawn from a Paſſage of TERTULLIAN, in his Book againſt PRAXEAS, is a mere Conjecture of his own, and a very groundleſs one; as Mr. DODWELL has prov'd, (in his *Diſſert. Singul.* &c. *p.* 174, 5.) And the Authority of the nameleſs Writer, publiſh'd by SIRMONDUS,, can never be allow'd; becauſe no body knows who he was, or when he wrote. Nor will this Author do him any ſervice, if EUSEBIUS has rightly fix'd the Death of Pope SOTER, to the Year 176. All that remains to be con-

ſider'd, is the Authority of EPIPHANIUS, who fixes the *Epocha* of *Montaniſm* to the nineteenth Year of ANTONINUS PIUS, *A. C.* 156. But EPIPHANIUS is ſo miſerable an Hiſtorian, and ſo perpetually in the wrong in all his Accounts of Time, (as his Commentator PETAVIUS has long ago obſerv'd, and even upon this very occaſion) that his Authority, in a point of Chronology, is never to be depended on, much leſs ought it to be ſet in competition with the Teſtimony of EUSEBIUS, who was a profeſs'd Hiſtorian and Chronologer. Among innumerable Examples which might be produc'd of his Ignorance or Negligence in theſe matters, I ſhall inſtance only in one ſignal Miſtake of this kind, in his Hiſtory of the preceding Hereſy, (*p.* 391.) where he places the Martyrdom of JUSTIN under the Reign of ADRIAN, tho the Apology of that Father, addreſs'd to the Succeſſors of ADRIAN, the ANTONINI, be ſtill extant. And I leave you to judge what Credit an Hiſtorian deſerves, who is capable of committing ſuch ſhameful and monſtrous Miſtakes?

§ 8.

§ 8. BUT to return to EUSEBIUS. In his Chronicle he has fix'd the *Epocha* of *Montaniſm* to the Year 171, which agrees very well with his Hiſtory, where 'tis plac'd after the Apology of APOLLINARIS, (*l.* iv. *c.* 27.) which was publiſh'd *A. C.* 170, according to the *Alexandrian* Chronicle. EUSEBIUS took his Accounts of this Hereſy from Authors who all liv'd in the Age of MONTANUS, or very near it; who, he ſays, had furniſh'd him with ample Materials for that Subject. And 'tis morally impoſſible he cou'd be miſtaken in placing the riſe of it, when one of his Authors, ASTERIUS URBANUS, has ſo preciſely fix'd it to the Proconſulſhip of GRATIUS in *Aſia*; a Character of Time, which, tho we are ignorant of, he cou'd not well be a ſtranger to. The Author of the Catalogue of Hereſies, (at the end of TERTULLIAN's *Præſcript.*) comes pretty near this Account, in joining it with TATIAN's Hereſy; which began, according to EUSEBIUS's *Chronicon*, in the Year 172. And the *Alexandrian* Chronicle, inſtead of carrying it as high as EPIPHANIUS, places it yet lower than

EUSEBIUS. But the Authority I chiefly inſiſt on, is the Teſtimony of EUSEBIUS: And the whole matter in diſpute may be reduc'd to this ſhort Iſſue, Whether he, or EPIPHANIUS, is moſt worthy of Credit; which is a point, I think, conſidering the Character of the latter, which can admit of no diſpute. GRABE, in the *Prolegomena* to his *Irenæus*, has urg'd an excellent Argument to confirm this Account of EUSEBIUS, to which I refer you, (*Sect.* ii. *c.* 2.) I am very much miſtaken if thoſe Arguments do not plainly prove that the Perſecution of *Lyons* ought to be ſet lower than the Year 167. Nor is there any neceſſity, allowing Mr. DODWELL's Suppoſition, that the Games were Quinquennial, to limit them preciſely to this particular Year, ſince there are other Years of ANTONINUS's Reign *Agonales*, as well as this; as for inſtance, 171, 175, 179. 'Twas for this Reaſon, that Biſhop PEARSON, being ſenſible that the Arguments againſt the Year 167 were unanſwerable, has taken a middle way, and fix'd the Perſecution to the Year 175; which Hypotheſis ſolves all the Difficulties on both ſides. And I ſhou'd certainly cloſe

cloſe with it, if I thought the Games Quinquennial. But till that Circumſtance is thorowly prov'd, I ſee no Reaſon why we ſhou'd depart from the *Epocha* of Eusebius; with which Account the *Alexandrian* Chronicle pretty nearly agrees, in placing it but the Year before, *viz.* 176. But allowing Eusebius to have miſplac'd the Perſecution of *Lyons*, does he not in that Chapter ſay, that the Perſecution rag'd, and made innumerable Martyrs in other parts of the World, that very Year 177? And will you ſay, that he is alſo miſtaken in the date of their Sufferings? You may as well queſtion the Truth of any other Tranſaction recorded in his Hiſtory. For my part, I cou'd never meet with any Arguments which cou'd ſhake the Credit of either of theſe Accounts. And if Criticks will take the liberty of rejecting the Authority of good Writers upon Conjectures ſo ill founded, there is an end of all Certainty in Hiſtory. I ſhall conclude this Section with one Obſervation, That I am firmly perſuaded the chief Motive which induc'd Eusebius to queſtion the Truth of this Miracle was, that

he plainly ſaw that 'twas inconſiſtent with the Perſecutions which follow'd it.

§ 9. I SHALL now paſs on to my other Proofs, that ANTONINUS perſecuted the Chriſtians after the date of this Miracle. And my firſt Authority ſhall be the *Alexandrian* Chronicle, which (in the only Edition I have ſeen, publiſh'd by SCALIGER without Notes or Tranſlation) under the firſt Year of COMMODUS, has theſe Words, Οὗτος ὁ Κόμμοδος ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ Κρατήσεως παύει τὸν διωγμὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, i. e. *Idem Commodus imperium adeptus, perſecutioni Eccleſiæ finem imponit.* Κράτησις is a Word I can't meet with in the old or new Lexicographers; for which Reaſon I am of SPANHEIM's Opinion, (*de præſt. Numiſm.* p 146, 7.) that 'tis a Word peculiar to the *Greeks* of *Alexandria*, tho not to their Medals only, as he fancies (for this Paſſage had eſcap'd him.) But he has certainly miſtaken the meaning of the Word, as this Place plainly proves: And Father HARDUIN, whom he pretends to confute, has rightly render'd it, as I have done, by *Imperium*: So that ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ κρατήσεως, is, *ſub ejus Imperio*, or, *eo imperante*.

Eu-

EUSEBIUS agrees with this Chronicle in fixing the Toleration to the beginning of COMMODUS, as you may ſee by comparing the ninth Chapter (*lib.* v.) with the twenty firſt Chapter of the ſame Book, which comes next it in order of Time: For EUSEBIUS, after a long Digreſſion, reſumes the Thread of his Narration, which he had broke off at *c.* 9. The ſame is confirm'd by DION CASSIUS, who, in the beginning of his Hiſtory of that Reign, makes COMMODUS a Favourer of the Chriſtians; and by ASTERIUS URBANUS, (*apud Euſeb. Hiſt.* v. 16.) who ſays that for thirteen Years after the Death of MAXIMILLA, the Propheteſs of the *Montaniſts*, both Church and State had injoy'd a profound Peace. This Mr. DODWELL very judiciouſly underſtands of the thirteen Years of COMMODUS. And indeed theſe two Characters of Time can agree to no other Period but his Reign, from the firſt riſe of *Montaniſm* to the Age of CONSTANTINE *the Great*. 'Tis true, there were ſome Incurſions of the Barbarians on the Frontiers, during this Interval; but they were not of moment enough to diſturb the publick Peace of the Empire, and

were of ſuch little Conſequence that they are not mention'd by HERODIAN, and but juſt touch'd upon by DIO. So that, by this Account, ASTERIUS wrote under the Emperor JULIANUS, or in the beginning of SEVERUS, before the Civil War between him and NIGER brake out. And if you reckon backwards from that time, you'll find that the firſt Year of COMMODUS muſt be the *Epocha* of the Toleration. From all theſe Authorities, it appears beyond exception, that COMMODUS put a ſtop to the Perſecution in the firſt Year of his Reign. Now I wou'd fain know what Perſecution COMMODUS put a ſtop to, except that which was ſet afoot in his Father's time, and which he left behind him at his Death. Not one Writer, either Heathen or Chriſtian, makes COMMODUS a Perſecutor; neither DIO, EUSEBIUS, SULPITIUS SEVERUS, nor even LACTANTIUS, tho COMMODUS dy'd a violent Death, which wou'd have ſuited very well with his Hypotheſis. And 'tis for no other Reaſon but the want of this ſingle Circumſtance, that he has ſtruck TRAJAN, the ANTONINI, and SEVERUS, out of the Liſt of the Perſecutors, tho

tho they were all notoriouſly ſo. If ANTONINUS, by his Edicts after the Miracle, had reſtor'd Peace to the Church, EUSEBIUS wou'd certainly have dated the Toleration from that Year, and not from the beginning of COMMODUS, as he plainly does in theſe Words, Κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν —— χρόνον μεταβέβλητο μὲν ἐπὶ τὸ πρᾶον τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς; which Words in the original (for VALESIUS has not fully expreſs'd their Force) import that the Proceedings of the Government, with relation to the Chriſtians, were chang'd into a gentler Treatment. Now ſince neither he, or any other Hiſtorian, pretends that there was a new Perſecution rais'd by COMMODUS, it plainly follows that the Perſecution which he ſtopt was that of his Father ANTONINUS.

§ 10. MY next Witneſs ſhall be THEOPHILUS ANTIOCHENUS, who wrote in the firſt Year of COMMODUS, and ſays the Perſecution ſtill continu'd: For the Affairs of the Empire, for ſome time after the Death of ANTONINUS, ran on in their old courſe; and 'twas not, in all likelihood, till his return to *Rome*, and his being

ing thorowly ſettled in the Government, that COMMODUS recall'd the Edicts of his Father, and gave the Chriſtians a Toleration. To this you anſwer, that this Perſecution was only the effect of ſome popular Tumults, after the Death of ANTONINUS. But this you advance without the leaſt Proof or Probability, and contrary to the plain meaning of the Words. For do not theſe Expreſſions, ἔτι μὲν and ἕως τοῦ δεῦρο, moſt manifeſtly imply, that the Perſecution had been of a long ſtanding, and not a new Commotion of the Mob? And 'tis as plain that it was not barely owing to the Cruelty of the People; for if it had not been openly incourag'd by the Government, how came Rewards and Honours (ἆθλα καὶ τιμαὶ) to be beſtow'd on thoſe who ſignaliz'd their Malice on this occaſion? This is a ſufficient Anſwer to all you have ſaid on this head, and my Argument from THEOPHILUS ſtands as firm as ever.

§ 11. UPON this occaſion it may not be improper to conſider an Argument of WITSIUS on this head, as 'tis cited by PAGI, (*ad Ann.* 174.) That Critick found

found that the Arguments for the perſecuting after this Miracle, were unanſwerable; and therefore, in order to reconcile them with this Edict, he pretends they were all rais'd by the Cruelty of the Mob, and the Provincial Governors. But this is a mere Shift and Evaſion: For how came the Edicts of ANTONINUS, on this occaſion, to be ſlighted, and thoſe of COMMODUS to be obey'd; as EUSEBIUS (v. 21.) aſſures us they were; and that by virtue of them, the Chriſtian Churches, in all parts of the World, enjoy'd a profound Peace? Is it likely that the looſe and diſſolute Reign of COMMODUS met with more Reſpect and Submiſſion than the wiſe and ſteddy Adminiſtration of ANTONINUS, who was lov'd and ador'd by the People; and to all his Gentleneſs of Diſpoſition, had all the Sternneſs and Severity which was requiſite in a good Governor? *in manifeſtos & gravium criminum reos inexorabilis*, ſays CAPITOLINUS, (*in M. Anton. c.* 24.) and wou'd never have ſuffer'd ſuch barbarous Outrages to have been committed in contempt of his own Edicts and Commands. And tho I can't deny but that ſome

ſome Perſecutions took their riſe from popular Tumults, as that of *Lyons*, (*Euſeb.* v. 1.) and under TRAJAN, (*Euſeb.* iii. 32.) yet it appears from their being carry'd on afterward in the legal and regular Forms of Juſtice, that they were at firſt ſet on, or tacitly approv'd by the Government. The only Inſtance that appears of a popular Perſecution, under a Prince who favour'd the Chriſtians, was in the laſt Year of the weak and deſpicable Reign of the Emperor PHILIP; whoſe Authority was grown ſo precarious, that there were no leſs than three Rebellions againſt him that very Year, which ended in the loſs of his Life and Empire.

§ 12. MY next Witneſs ſhall be ANTONINUS himſelf, in his own Book. But to make this Argument bear, it will be requiſite in the firſt place to ſettle the Age of his Book, which I take to be all written after the Date of this Miracle. The firſt Book is dated in his Camp, on the River *Granua*, or *Gran*, in the Territory of the *Quadi*. DIO places this miraculous Victory over the *Quadi*, in the beginning of the War with them, immediately

diately after the Defeat of the *Jazyges* and *Marcomanni*, who fled into their Country for ſhelter. *Carnuntum* (which in PEUTENGER's Tables is plac'd a little below *Vienna* on the *Danube*, and is ſuppos'd to be now call'd *Hainburgh*) is agreed by all the antient Writers to have been his Place of Arms, or head Quarters in this War. And if he had advanc'd from *Carnuntum* as far as the River *Gran*, he muſt by that time have conquer'd and over-run the greateſt part of their Territory; which ſhows that this great Battle was won before the Date of the firſt Book. The ſecond Book is dated in his Winter-Quarters at *Carnuntum*, after his Return from this Expedition, *Pannonica hyberna Carnunti*, ſays PLINY, (iv. 12.) In Book the 4th *c.* 10. (*Meric. Caſaub. Edit.*) there is a manifeſt Alluſion to the Rebellion of CASSIUS, (*A. C.* 175.) For CASSIUS, while he thought ANTONINUS alive, had always laugh'd at him for his Philoſophy, (*Vulcatius in Caſſio*, *c.* 1.) but upon a falſe Report of his Death uſurp'd the Empire, and declar'd him a God, (*Vulcatius* ib. *c.* 7.) The ſame Event is alluded to in the ſame Book, (*c.* 21.) for CASSIUS

SIUS was the only Man who aſpir'd to the Empire in his Reign. In *lib.* x. *c.* 11. there is a Paſſage relating to the *Sarmatian* War, which broke out afreſh *A. C.* 177. His old Age and Infirmities, which are ſo often mention'd, with ſome other notes of Time, which for brevity's ſake I omit, are all manifeſt Arguments that he compos'd this Book in the latter part of his Life: And no Critick, that I know of, pretends to queſtion it.

HAVING ſettled the Premiſes, I ſhall proceed to my Argument, which is founded on a remarkable Paſſage, (*lib.* ii. *c.* 3.) where he ſays, That the Chriſtians ran headlong upon Death, with a brutal Obſtinacy. This Paſſage proves that there was then a Perſecution on foot againſt the Chriſtians, and that ANTONINUS, when he wrote, had the Sufferings of our Martyrs in his eye. One wou'd think, ſays Mr. DACIER, at the rate he writes, that he ſaw ſome Martyrs every day. XYLANDER wonders at it, conſidering his great Age, and what he had formerly written, meaning his Edict. Theſe are the Sentiments of two great Criticks, who judg'd

judg'd fairly and impartially; tho 'tis apparent that neither of them was ignorant of the Conſequences which might be drawn from it, to ſhake the Credit of a Miracle which both of them believ'd; and it is moſt certainly the plain and natural ſenſe of the Paſſage, and moſt agreeable to ANTONINUS's way of writing. But beſides this, the ill Character he gives of the Chriſtians, after this pretended Miracle, is another Proof that he never publiſh'd any Edict in their favour: For is it poſſible to conceive, that he wou'd have deſcrib'd them as a Company of mad deſperate Enthuſiaſts, who ſacrific'd their Lives out of a ſullen Stubbornneſs, after he had ſo ſolemnly declar'd to the World, in his Letters and Edicts, that by their Prayers they cou'd command the Elements, call for Thunder and Rain, and ſave and ruin Armies at their Pleaſure?

§ 13. *BARONIUS* has offer'd ſome probable Arguments to prove there was a Perſecution at this time; but ſince they are all founded on the Dates of ſome Laws that are not very certain, I ſhall not inſiſt upon them: Nor is it neceſſary to

produce any more Arguments, ſince theſe I have already advanc'd prove beyond all reaſonable exception, that ANTONINUS perſecuted the Chriſtians after this Deliverance. And the Conſequence I have drawn from it, that he publiſh'd no Edict in their favour, is ſo certain, that I am reſolv'd to truſt it to its own Strength, without offering one Syllable in its defence; much leſs am I concern'd to vindicate the Perſecutions of ANTONINUS. I think them the only Blemiſhes in that excellent Reign, and the greateſt Misfortune that cou'd have befallen the Chriſtians, to be perſecuted by ſo great and good a Man.

A Defence of the fifth Article,

That the Chriſtians in general did not believe this Miracle, notwithſtanding the Teſtimony of APOLLINARIS *and* TERTULLIAN.

THE ſilence of all the Chriſtian Writers, except TERTULLIAN, from the Death of ANTONINUS to the Reign of CONSTANTINE, is as ſtrong a Proof as a negative Argument can be, that the Miracle was not generally believ'd in that Age. It might be mention'd, you ſay, by ſome Writers now loſt. And it might not. And the Proofs are equal on both ſides. GREGORY NYSSEN, you ſay, drew his Account from Authors not now extant. But he might take the Subſtance of the Story from TERTULLIAN and EUSEBIUS, and add the reſt from Tradition and common Fame, (from whence he had his Memoirs for the Life of GREGORY THAUMATURGUS, as Mr. DODWELL aſſures us, *Diſſert. Cyrian.* iv. 16.)

or what is moſt likely, from his own fruitful Invention; a Faculty which the Fathers of that Age, who wrote Panegyricks upon Saints and Martyrs, excell'd in: Witneſs his Brother BASIL's Homily upon the ſame Subject, with ATHANASIUS's Life of St. ANTHONY, and St. JEROM's of HILARION, and PAUL the Hermit; which are all Maſter-Pieces in their kind, and no way inferior to the golden Legend. The ſame Anſwer will ſerve for OROSIUS and XIPHILIN. And there is not the leaſt colour to infer from EUSEBIUS that he had found this Story in any Writers of the ſecond or third Century, except thoſe whom he has cited. But what excuſe can you make for the ſilence of ſo many learned Apologiſts, whoſe Works are ſtill extant; whom you can never ſuppoſe ignorant of a Miracle, which, as you ſay, made ſo much Noiſe in the World, and was ſo near the Age in which moſt of them wrote? What Motive cou'd induce them to ſtifle a Miracle ſo glorious to the Chriſtian Cauſe, and ſo popular an Argument to the Heathens? it being an *Argumentum ad hominem*; which of all others is the moſt perſuaſive to an

Ad-

Adverſary, becauſe it's drawn from his own Principles and Conceſſions. I ſhall paſs over TATIAN and MINUCIUS FELIX, becauſe I am not certain whether they wrote before or after the Miracle; and IRENÆUS, becauſe he had no occaſion to mention this Miracle in his Book againſt Hereſies; and little elſe of his Writings is preſerv'd. I ſhall content my ſelf with naming three *Greek* Fathers, THEOPHILUS, CLEMENS, and ORIGEN; and as many *Latin* ones, CYPRIAN, ARNOBIUS, and LACTANTIUS, who were the greateſt and moſt eloquent Men of the Age they liv'd in, and the ableſt Advocates that ever appear'd for Chriſtianity, till the late Reſtoration of Learning. And not one of theſe has made the leaſt mention of this Story, in his Writings. I wou'd fain ſee a good Reaſon produc'd for this affected ſilence. How came THEOPHILUS to forget a Miracle which happen'd but ſeven Years before he wrote his Defence of Chriſtianity, for the Converſion of AUTOLYCUS, and which perhaps wou'd have weigh'd more with that learned Heathen than all his Arguments beſides? How came it to eſcape the

univerſal Reading and Induſtry of CLEMENS? Had ORIGEN given credit to it, in every Page he wou'd have thrown it in the teeth of CELSUS. How came St. CYPRIAN to miſs this Miracle, he who was ſo known an Admirer of TERTULLIAN, and tranſcrib'd a good part of his Apology into his Treatiſe *De Vanitate Idolorum*, and yet paſſes this Story over in ſilence? What endleſs Triumphs wou'd ARNOBIUS and LACTANTIUS have made upon this Subject, had they believ'd it? To be ſhort, I know no way of accounting for the ſilence of all theſe Writers, but by either aſcribing it to their Sincerity and Generoſity, in ſcorning to impoſe ſo groſs a Fiction on the World, or elſe to their Judgment and Diſcretion, in not venturing the Honour of their Religion on the credit of a Story ſo weakly warranted. And I am apt to think that the firſt Broachers of this Miracle were ſo ſeverely mortify'd by the Heathens for their Credulity, as taught moſt of their Succeſſors to write with more Guard and Caution for the future.

§ 2. *THEMISTIUS* might have made a parallel of the Virtues of ANTONINUS

NINUS and THEODOSIUS, without affronting his Religion by denying it the Honour of a Miracle, which you ſuppoſe to have been univerſally believ'd in that Age. CLAUDIAN and he were both Men of Addreſs, and Maſters of all the Arts of Flattery, and were incapable of making their court ſo ill to two Princes who had ſhewn more Zeal in eſtabliſhing Chriſtianity, and rooting out the laſt Remains of Paganiſm, than all their Predeceſſors. Such a Compliment wou'd have been an Affront to ſuch Religious Princes, had the Miracle been generally believ'd at that time. 'Tis in vain to charge it on their Bigotry; for it is well known that CLAUDIAN, tho a *pervicaciſſimus Paganus*, as OROSIUS ſtyles him, made no ſcruple to cry up the Storm under THEODOSIUS for a Miracle, becauſe the Court-Flatterers had given it that Name: which makes me think he wou'd as eaſily have given Chriſtianity the Honour of this other Miracle, had it been challengd by the Chriſtians of that Age.

§ 3. I AM not concern'd to vindicate the Candor of EUSEBIUS, or any other

Church-Hiſtorian. I wiſh I cou'd always excuſe them: But I am thorowly perſuaded that he did not believe this Miracle. You ſee with what an Air of Diſtruſt he begins his Relation: λόγος ἔχει, *There goes a Report.* And tho a little lower he makes a faint Complement to the Sincerity of the Chriſtian Writers, he cloſes all with this cold Expreſſion, *But of this matter let every man judge as he thinks fit.* Does not this plainly imply, that he queſtion'd the Truth of the Fact? 'Tis as much as if he had ſaid, I have told you this Story, and nam'd my Authors, but will not anſwer for the Truth of it. 'Tis in this ſenſe that VALESIUS underſtands him; and a greater Man than he, Biſhop PEARSON, in his *Vindiciæ Ignat.* Part ii. p. 161. *Tum vero narrationem quandam ſtatim interſerit de Legione Fulmineâ, quam velut incertum relinquit.* I hope the Authority of this learned Prelate, for whom you profeſs ſo profound a Reſpect, will have its due weight with you on this occaſion.

§ 4. THAT TERTULLIAN had imbrac'd the Hereſy of MONTANUS before he

he wrote his Apology, and his Treatiſe to SCAPULA, in which Pieces only he makes mention of this Miracle, may be very eaſily prov'd. That he was turn'd *Montaniſt* before he compos'd his Diſcourſe *De Coronâ Militis*, is apparent from this Paſſage, (*c.* 1.) *Planè ſupereſt ut etiam Martyria recuſare meditentur, qui Prophetias ejuſdem Spiritûs Sancti reſpuerunt.* Is not this a plain Alluſion to the Prophecies of the *Montaniſts*, which he condemns the Catholicks for rejecting? And to what other Sect does the Principle which he aſſerts, of not flying in time of Perſecution, belong? This demonſtrates that he was then a *Montaniſt*, and no body pretends to deny it. This Treatiſe was written before the Perſecution of SEVERUS, as appears from the very next Sentence, *Muſſitant deniq; (Chriſtiani) tam bonam & longam ſibi Pacem periclitari.* That is, the Chriſtians, by this raſh and indiſcreet Act of the Soldier, thought themſelves in danger of loſing the Toleration they had ſo long enjoy'd. Does not this Sentence plainly prove that he wrote this Piece before the Perſecution broke out? (vid. *Pagi ad Ann.* 199.) And

'tis

'tis as certain that his Apology, and Treatiſe to SCAPULA, were written long after, in the heat of the Perſecution, as appears from the whole tenor of both of them, is confeſs'd by all the World, and needs no Proof; and conſequently he was a *Montaniſt* when he wrote them. His believing the Dreams and Viſions of old Women, ſhows him the moſt credulous Writer in the World, (*de Animâ* c. 9.) as SPONDANUS has long ago obſerv'd. And as for his Enthuſiaſm, I refer you to his Character drawn by MALEBRANCHE. You ſee upon what excellent Authority the whole Credit of your Miracle reſts. As for APOLLINARIS, I refer you to my Defence of the ſecond Article.

A Defence of the ſixth Article,

That the Deliverance of the Roman *Army, tho undoubtedly true, was no Miracle.*

IN anſwer to this Article, you have not offer'd one Syllable to prove the Deliverance of the *Roman* Army to be a ſupernatural Event or Effect, which is

Arch-

Archbiſhop TILLOTSON's, and Mr. LOCKE's Definition of a Miracle, and which perfectly well agrees with the Miracles of our Saviour. His raiſing Men from the dead, the Eclipſe at his Paſſion, with his Reſurrection and Aſcenſion, are ſolid and ſubſtantial Miracles, and exceeded all the Powers of natural Cauſes. Theſe were infallible Proofs of his Divine Miſſion, and a rational ground for Mankind to imbrace his Religion; and were admirably well contriv'd by the Divine Wiſdom to make way for the Converſion of the World, by leaving no room for Infidels to aſcribe his mighty Works to the ſtanding Laws of Nature, or the ordinary Courſe of ſecond Cauſes. But what is there in your Miracle that might not be wrought by natural Means? Or what has it peculiar to diſtinguiſh it from the parallel Inſtances I have produc'd, and which you deny to be Miracles? And to which I ſhall add two more, *viz.* The Storm of Thunder which drove the *Perſians* from *Delphi*, (*Herod. lib.* viii.) and gave SEVERUS's Army the Victory over NIGER's, (*Dio* p. 643.) Was it the nice Juncture in which it happen'd? But that Circum-

ſtance is common to them all. Is it to be thought a Miracle, becauſe it is cry'd up for one by all the Hiſtorians who relate it? And were not the Facts I have produc'd, cry'd up for Miracles by all the Hiſtorians who relate them? And is not the Authority of my Hiſtorians as good as that of yours? But I wonder to ſee you urge the Opinions of theſe Writers as an unanſwerable Argument to prove this Victory a Miracle: For if they have given us true matter of Fact, we are beſt Judges whether 'twas a Miracle or not; becauſe we are far better Divines and Philoſophers than they were. In ſhort, my Facts are ſo intirely parallel with yours, in all their Circumſtances, that you muſt of force admit them to be all Miracles, or give up your own. If you grant the firſt, I know where to have you: If the laſt, you yield the point in debate. If you will do neither, I muſt beg of you to lay down ſome common Criterion to judge when ſuch ſtrange and odd Events, which you own to be ſometimes perform'd by natural Means, are miraculous, and when they are not.

§ 2.

§ 2. THE Victories of the great Conquerors of Antiquity, which you ſeem to aſcribe to a miraculous Power, were all conducted by the common Methods of Providence, whereby God Almighty always proportions Means to Ends, and never fails of ſuitable Inſtruments to accompliſh all his wiſe Deſigns; otherwiſe Miracles might be multiply'd without end. CÆSAR by *Fortune* never meant *Providence*; for he was an *Epicurean*, as appears from his Speech in *Salluſt*, and CATO's Reply. Your Inſtance of the Defeat of *Siſera*, proves nothing but that the *Jews*, by the favour of a bright ſtarry Night, which was no wonder, deſtroy'd their Enemy's Army to a Man. This Senſe, among all the various Interpretations I have ſeen of this Place, ſeems to me the moſt natural. But I wonder that a Man, ſo well vers'd in the Scriptures, ſhou'd have recourſe to ſo obſcure a Text, when ſo plain and parallel an Inſtance lay in the way; I mean, the Defeat of the *Philiſtine* Army by Thunder, obtain'd from Heaven by the Prayers of SAMUEL. This Fact, tho it cannot properly, in the

ſtrict and genuine ſenſe of the Word, be ſtyl'd a Miracle, becauſe it did not ſurpaſs the Powers of natural Cauſes, yet it muſt be own'd to have been an extraordinary Act of Providence, and well deſerves a Place in the lower form of Miracles; becauſe 'twas preternatural, and not perform'd by the ordinary Concurrence of ſecond Cauſes, but by the immediate hand of God, as SAMUEL expreſly teſtifies. And when you can bring as good Vouchers that the Deliverance of ANTONINUS was wrought in the ſame manner, I ſhall be content to allow it in the ſame Quality: But till that is done, you muſt give me leave to ſet it on the ſame level with the parallel Hiſtories I have produc'd, and to conſider it as one of thoſe extraordinary Accidents which PLINY (*Ep.* 13. *lib.* 9.) calls *fortuita, ſed non tanquam fortuita*, that were mere Chance, but did not look like Chance.

§ 3. IN the next place, you draw up a heavy Charge againſt me, for ſaying, *That when Chriſtianity had been once eſtabliſh'd by undoubted Miracles, 'twas high time for them to ceaſe, becauſe God Almighty*

mighty never waſtes them in vain. I confeſs I am no *Divine*, and if I ventur'd out of my depth, 'twas upon the Authority of ſo great a Man as Biſhop STILLINGFLEET, who was never thought to miſrepreſent the Senſe of the *Reform'd Churches* upon this Head. His Words are theſe, (in his Examination of the Miracles of the Church of *Rome*, *p.* 665.) " The " —Doctrine of Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, " being thus confirm'd by the Miracles " wrought by them, there cannot be any " ſuch neceſſity, in ſucceeding Ages, to " confirm the ſame Doctrine by Miracles," (*vid. p.* 691.) *P.* 666. he has theſe following Words, " God, we are certain, " doth not imploy his Power in going " beyond the common Effects of Nature, " to little or no purpoſe; that is, never " waſtes Miracles in vain." I wou'd fain know what I have ſaid on this Subject that can't be fairly warranted by the Principles of this excellent Prelate. And tho he has not preciſely determin'd the Time when Chriſtianity was eſtabliſh'd, and conſequently when Miracles, by his Hypotheſis, ought to ceaſe, yet that Point can admit of no diſpute; for we are certain that

that 'twas ſettled in all Parts of the known World long before the Date of this Miracle, as EUSEBIUS expreſly affirms, (*l.* iii. *c.*37. *l.* iv. *c.*7. vid. *Lactant. de mort. Perſec. c.* 2, 3.) I wrote that Paſſage with a juſt Indignation, to ſee the Dignity of God Almighty ſo meanly proſtituted, by bringing him immediately upon the Stage for every low and trifling Occaſion. I thought that Maxim,

Nec Deus interſit ——

as true in Divinity, as Poetry. I believe that God manages his infinite Power with infinite Wiſdom, and never breaks the ſettled Laws of the Creation but for ſome great and wiſe Ends. And what wiſe End of Providence cou'd be anſwer'd by this Miracle, ſince none of your own Authors pretend that it made one ſingle Convert to Chriſtianity? You have judg'd rightly about my Opinion of St. CHRYSOSTOM's Miracle: For I can never allow common Accidents, or the ordinary Effects of Nature to paſs for Miracles. I freely own that the Reaſon you have given for the Mi-

Miracle under JULIAN is better than mine, and I thank you for it.

§ 4. UPON the whole matter, I am firmly perſuaded that this Miracle ought to be rank'd among the numerous Impoſtures of thoſe Ages, which are too plain to be deny'd, and too ſhameful to be defended. Not that I am ſo uncharitable as to charge the Faults and Follies of particular Men on the whole Body of the Chriſtian Writers. On the contrary, I think them the Perſons chiefly impos'd on, and that the far greater part of the Fictions, which appear in the Authors of the three firſt Centuries, were not wilful Lyes of their own Invention, but Miſtakes, flowing from an eaſy Credulity, and warm Sallies of Zeal, that wou'd not ſuffer them over-nicely to examine the Authority of ſome Facts which they thought wou'd ſerve for the Advancement of their Cauſe. But this unhappy Conduct has had a quite different Effect from what they imagine: And I have often reflected, with Concern, on the infinite Scandal and Prejudice which Chriſtianity has ſuſtain'd by theſe fatal Frauds and Forgeries, which have ex-

pos'd it to the Scorn and Contempt of the Deiſts, and furniſh'd them with the only plauſible Weapons which they imploy in attacking it. Truth, and the beſt Cauſe in the World, can never need the Support of ſuch mean and unworthy Artifices: And Dr. HICKS and his Friends will do little ſervice to the common Cauſe by the Project they are ſetting on foot, to revive theſe old exploded Fables and Fooleries, which ſerv'd well enough in the dull Days of *Monkery*, but will be laugh'd at in this inquiſitive Age, where nothing will paſs but ſolid Proof and ſevere Reaſoning.

Non tali auxilio, nec Defenſoribus iſtis Tempus eget.

'Twere to be wiſh'd, for the Honour of Chriſtianity, that future *Apologiſts* wou'd ſhun ſuch dangerous Arguments, and ſtick to the fair Topicks by which Chriſtianity may invincibly be defended, I mean, the Inſufficiency of the Law of Nature, and the Neceſſity of a Divine Revelation at that Juncture, to reform the Corruption of the World; the Miracles of Chriſt, and

the Apoſtles; the Accompliſhment of the Prophecies; its wonderful Propagation, with the Numbers, and undaunted Sufferings of our Martyrs; the Purity and Excellency of its Precepts; their Agreeableneſs to the Law of Reaſon and the Divine Attributes, with ſome few other Articles: which, if rightly urg'd and apply'd, can never be anſwer'd by all the Wit and Malice of the Deiſts. I ſhall conclude all with a ſevere Reflection of PHOTIUS, on IRENÆUS's falſe and precarious way of Reaſoning, and which may be apply'd to moſt of the Fathers of thoſe Ages: Ἐν τισὶν αὐτῶν ἡ τῆς κατὰ τὰ ἐκκλησιαστικὰ δόγματα ἀληθείας ἀκρίβεια νόθοις λογισμοῖς κιβδηλεύεται. *Cod.* 120. *p.* 301.

Mr. *K*——'s Brief Notes,

On the Defence of Article I. Part I.

Ad Sect. 1. Note 1.

THO I grant your Concluſion, I can't be ſaid to give up a Point I never contended for. I don't remember that I ever aſſerted there was an entire Legion of Chriſtians in the Army of ANTONINUS. *I am only of opinion that there were Chriſtians in the Army, and eſpecially in the* Thundering Legion.

N. 2. *NO Rule of Grammar will warrant that Conſtruction of the Words in* LUCIAN *of ſome Chriſtians, and—many Epicureans, (allowing Atheiſts to be ſo underſtood) ſeeing the Copulative & joins them together, without any diſtinction.*

N. 3. *I KNOW 'tis the* Impoſtor, *and not* LUCIAN, *who ſays* that; *yet 'tis not deny'd by him.*

N. 4. PLINY *muſt be underſtood literally. He wrote to* TRAJAN *in the moſt plain*

plain and ſimple manner of an Hiſtorian, not with the rhetorical Flouriſhes of an Orator; it being his Buſineſs to give the Emperor a punctual relation of matter of fact only. 'Tis in vain to ſay, that upon trial he did not find the number of the Chriſtians great; for it was after the ſtricteſt ſcrutiny. The periclitantium numerus, *&c. of the Chriſtians, and the* prope jam deſolata Templa, *and* victimarum rariſſimus emptor *of the Gentiles, are certain Mediums for us to determine the number of the one, to be far greater than the number of the other, in that part of* Aſia.

N. 5. *TRUE, 'tis a jeſt to ſuppoſe them as numerous as the Heathen in* Rome, *there being ſo many hundred thouſands in that City. 'Tis likewiſe a jeſt to ſuppoſe them not above ſeven or eight thouſand, ſeeing the burning of* Rome *was attributed to them, and* NERO *publickly honour'd for ſuppreſſing them, as he vainly thought.*

N. 6. *I DON'T think your Inſtance out of* TULLY, *interpreted by* JOSEPHUS,

ſufficient, unleſs you can prove that the Jews *had the ſame Encouragement for fifty Years together, which they had from* JULIUS CÆSAR *and* AUGUSTUS. *You know that moſt of the following Emperors were not their Friends.*

N. 7. *THE number of the* Bacchanalians, *in* LIVY, *was indeed ſet forth in extravagant Terms, by the Zeal of the Informer, and the Flouriſhes of the Council, at the time of the Accuſation: but after the Examination, there was no more an* alter pene populus; *but a bare ſeven thouſand are the numbers in* PLINY, *reduc'd to a certain and low Sum.*

Ad § 2. *YOU have whipt the Chriſtians out of the Senate for the moſt part, but not altogether; for tho* TERTULLIAN *may exaggerate their numbers, and ſo leſſen their belief, yet you own there were ſome but Diſſemblers of their Religion, as* APOLLONIUS. *And can you really think him an Hypocrite, and at the ſame time a Martyr? Martyrdom ſurely is the Teſt of a ſincere Chriſtian. An Hypocrite wou'd deny the Faith rather*

rather than die, and be damn'd to rights, ſince he knows the hotteſt Place in Hell to be his Lot.

Ad § 5. *I'm ſtill of opinion that* Rome *was not the head Quarters of Chriſtianity, tho I allow it to be* Eccleſia principalis, *at that time; as it was the Head of the Empire, and that drew ſuch Quantities of Hereticks to it. They cou'd find better Quarter there than true Chriſtians. But do you in truth underſtand* IRENÆUS, *as if he meant the* Romiſh *Church was the moſt antient, as well as moſt populous, (for his Words were not to be diſjoin'd) without forgetting that the Chriſtian Church was born at* Jeruſalem, *and chriſten'd at* Antioch? *Surely that good Father's Words may moſt properly be conſtru'd, a very antient and very populous Church, without making the Daughter primæval to the Mother; which even Miracle and Myſtery won't help you out in, if this witty Age wou'd allow them.*

Ad § 7. *THE Argument from the* Epiſtles *you are pleas'd to ridicule, with producing a greater number of* Epiſtles *to*

prove (*if that were a good way of arguing*) *that* Greece *was the Center of Chriſtianity. But ſurely if your Memory did ſerve you as well in matters of Scripture, as in this of other Authors, you wou'd not endeavour to put this Banter upon me; for did not St.* JOHN *write to ſeven Churches of* Aſia? *which Inſtance is ſufficient to alter your Center again. What if the head Quarters of Chriſtianity were, as you term it, often ſhifted? that is, ſometimes more Chriſtians were at one place, ſometimes at another; does that prove the greater number of them was not at* Epheſus *at that time, and the adjacent Country? In all probability there was more frequent Preaching of the Apoſtles, and their Succeſſors, in theſe Parts, ſo nigh the Fountain of Chriſtianity, than in any other; which the* Acts *of the* Apoſtles, *and* EUSEBIUS's *Hiſtory, will give us credit in believing; and ſo, of conſequence, a greater Concourſe of Chriſtians; which cauſed ſo many Perſecutions in* Aſia, *more than any other Place. And from hence it was they had more* Apologiſts, *who wrote to*

the

the Emperors to ſtem the tide of their grievous Sufferings.

Ad § 8. *THERE is no neceſſity of underſtanding the* Legio Fulminans *of* ANTONINE, *to be originally* Aſiatick. *'Tis enough for my purpoſe if it was recruited there. 'Tis not the number of* Aſiaticks *that I contend for, ſo much as the quality of them. That there were ſome Chriſtians among them, is ſufficient.*

AFTER all, I can't but wonder why you ſhou'd ſtrain ſo much to leſſen the numbers of Chriſtians in the firſt Ages of the Church, when their great Increaſe was ſo notorious. I ſhall offer to your Conſideration an Inſtance of this, in the two firſt Sermons preach'd by St. PETER *after our Lord's Aſcenſion: at one of which were converted three thouſand,* Acts ii. 41. *at the other five thouſand,* Acts iv. 4. *So* mightily grew the Word of God, and prevail'd, *at the preaching of one of the Apoſtles; how much more may we reaſonably believe did Chriſtians multiply at the preaching of all the reſt?*

Article

Article I. Part II.

Ad § 1. *I AM ſorry to find your Temper a little too much diſcompos'd by what I have ſaid, in anſwer to you, upon this Article. A Maſter of ſo much Reaſon I cou'd not imagine wou'd have any way yielded himſelf up to his Reſentments. A Perſon of the greateſt* Genius *may ſometimes be ſhewn an Error by one of an inferior Capacity. To convince you of this, do but look into the Proof you brought from* CELSUS, *to ſtrengthen what you had urg'd againſt Chriſtians being in the Army,* viz. CELSUS *makes it one of his Charges againſt the Chriſtians, that they refus'd to bear Arms for the Emperor. Compare this with what you afterward ſaid, towards the cloſe of your Diſcourſe, on the firſt Article,* viz. *The Chriſtians, for reaſons of State which were very obvious, were not ſuffer'd to bear Arms under perſecuting Reigns. How theſe two Sentiments, being brought into one view, will agree together, I muſt confeſs my ſelf wholly unable to underſtand. Either* CELSUS

SUS *was not juſt in his Charge, or the Obſervation is not juſt, that Chriſtians were not ſuffer'd to bear Arms; for to charge them at the ſame time, for not doing what they were not ſuffer'd to do, is a great Injuſtice; and not to ſuffer them to do what is charg'd home upon them as their Duty, is an uncommon piece of Hardſhip.*

PARDON me, Sir, if I bring you this one Inſtance to convince you, that a great Man may miſtake, and to induce you to be eaſy in paſſing by the Failings of others, who don't pretend to an equality of Parts and Penetration. Your direct Proof of matter of fact, that there were no Chriſtians in the Army, from the Charge of CELSUS, *is not ſo forcible, you ſee, as you wou'd intimate; eſpecially if we conſider the contrary is matter of fact, out of* TERTULLIAN; *who, if he is a good Evidence in one thing, I know not why he ſhou'd not be in another. You bring him often to juſtify what you aſſert, but reject him when I produce him; which is not very impartial. In this caſe he is very plain and poſitive,*

that

that numbers of Chriſtian Soldiers were in the Army; and gives alſo a particular Inſtance in the Affair of the Soldier who refus'd to wear the Crown. What he ſays in his Book de Corona, *in defence of that Soldier, and againſt the reſt that wore it, is a good Argument that there were no idolatrous Teſts impos'd on them; for the greateſt Act of Idolatry that he charges them with, is wearing the Crown in honour (as he interprets it) of the Heathen Gods. If they had been guilty of any other Act of that kind, they wou'd ſurely have heard of it in the heat of his Zeal. That the Chriſtian Soldiers were exempted from the Teſts, I have reaſon to believe from the Conſideration of what* MARCUS *himſelf ſays of the Chriſtians, in that excellent Reſcript he wrote in their behalf in the beginning of his Reign; their firmneſs to their Principles, their conſtancy in their Sufferings, their contempt of Death, their auſtere Diſcipline, their unexceptionable Fidelity in the Truſt committed to them, their Reverence to the Imperial Station, as ſet over them by God, for whoſe ſake they ſo willingly beſtow'd their Lives,*

eſpecially

eſpecially when adminiſter'd by a Perſon ſo fit for it as MARCUS, *who was too wiſe and good a Perſon to rob himſelf, as well as the Publick, of the Service of Perſons ſo exquiſitely qualify'd for military Imployments, by needleſs Impoſitions on their Conſciences, after the Publication of ſo gracious an Edict in their favour, which you your ſelf acknowledge to be genuine, and no one, that I ever yet met with, queſtions.*

I AM ſo far from begging the Queſtion, as you ſay, that I only take what you grant, that there were Chriſtians in the Army in SEVERUS's *time, who began his Reign not above twenty Years after* ANTONINUS: *So that, in all probability, the Soldiers of one Emperor were in the Army of the other, and were Idolaters in neither, becauſe they were perſecuted for not being ſo. And ſtill it will not be a ſeeming Difficulty, but a manifeſt Contradiction, to ſay that the Chriſtian Soldiers were Idolaters, whilſt in the Army, and yet turn'd out for not being Idolaters. Your ſportive Addition of the Word* enough, *will not ſatisfy; for 'tis*

notorious that the leaſt Circumſtance of Occaſional Conformity *wou'd have been ſufficient to have excus'd them. But thoſe Chriſtians had not ſo learned Chriſt; they had no notion of the modern and moderate way of complying upon occaſion, againſt Principle.*

ARTICLE II.

Ad § 1. N. 1. *THAT all the Advocates for the Miracle have given up this Article as a Point never to be maintain'd, I preſume is a Miſtake, (underſtanding this to be the Legion plac'd at* Melitene, *in* Cappadocia :) *For* SALMASIUS, *in his Notes on* CAPITOLINUS, C. 24. *where he convinces* SCALIGER *of an Error about the name of the* Melitenian *Legion, ſays, that this was the ſame which was afterwards call'd* the Thundering. *And perhaps we ſhou'd find* CASAUBON *of the like Opinion, cou'd we but learn what Diſcourſe it is which he promis'd in his Notes on* CAPITOLINUS, *where he proves the Victory of* ANTONINUS *to be obtain'd by the Prayers of the Chriſtian Soldiers in his Army. I*

am

am glad to ſee that you ſo far agree with SALMASIUS, *as to call it the* Melitenian *and not* Melitinian *Legion, as you did in your former Diſcourſe. This has convinc'd you of its being quarter'd, at leaſt, at* Melitene, *if not nam'd from thence; and has put you upon a diligent Search after the Legion thro'out the preceding Reigns, home to* ANTONINUS. *And your Inquiry is ſo far advantageous to the Truth of the Miracle, that it proves the* Thundering Legion *fix'd at* Melitene, *to have been a Legion long imploy'd in thoſe parts of* Aſia *which abounded with Chriſtians: and if it was not rais'd there, in all probability 'twas recruited; and that is much the ſame to me: For I am not ſollicitous whether this be the old Legion of* AUGUSTUS, *perhaps vulgarly call'd* Melitenian, *becauſe quarter'd there, and ſaid by the Emperor to be* verè fulminea *from the Miracle, or properly ſo nam'd, and from the Action alone ſtyl'd* the Thundering: (*You muſt allow me to conjecture, ſince by your own conjecturing you have authoriz'd me in it.*) *'Tis enough for me if there was ſuch a Legion in the Army*

at

at the time of the Victory, and that there were any Chriſtians therein: For 'twas not by their Multitude, but the Power of their Prayers, the Miracle was wrought. This is the point alone that I contend for, which is not at all given up.

N. 2. *I AM glad to ſee you have acquitted* APOLLINARIS, *after your ſevere Reflections upon him. I am with you and* VALESIUS, *in blaming* EUSEBIUS *for neither citing the Words nor particular Treatiſe of* APOLLINARIS; *but can't agree with you that he has falſify'd in quoting a Book which never was extant. I only ſuppoſe he miſtook in the Quotation.*

ARTICLE III.

Ad § 1. *THE Charge of Bigotry and Malice in the Heathen, againſt the Chriſtians, is not at all evaded by what you ſay. To quote* LUCIAN *for an Inſtance of their ſpeaking well of the Chriſtians, is one of the greateſt Paradoxes imaginable; one who made it his Buſineſs to ridicule them and their Religion,*

Legion almoſt wherever he ſpake of them. TACITUS *calls their Religion* exitiabilis ſuperſtitio; *and* PLINY, prava & immodica: *their Firmneſs to their Principles and Reſolution*, pervicacia & inflexibilis obſtinatio. *And theſe are ſome of the beſt things ſaid of them.* PLINY's *juſt and noble Character is the bare recital of the Examination of the Chriſtians, which was but common Juſtice.* DIO, *and the ſix Writers of the* Hiſt. Auguſt. *ſcarce name them at all; and therefore 'tis no wonder they don't name them with Reproach.* AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS *is the only one of your Authors, who is intirely fair in his Character of them and their Religion.*

N. 2. *YOU ask*, how came ſuch a Bigot and Perſecutor as ANTONINUS to aſcribe the Victory to the Chriſtians? *If you allow his Reſcript* ad Com. Aſiæ, *to be genuine* (*as it is generally allow'd to be, and I think you do*) *I can't ſee how you can call him a Bigot and a Perſecutor: For, cou'd a Bigot ſo handſomly check the Outrage of the People againſt the Chriſtians, by telling them how unjuſt*

it was to puniſh the People for adoring the immortal God, and putting their Truſt in him, in times of uncommon Calamities, when at the ſame time their Hearts fail'd them for fear, and were Heathens indeed, worſhipping no God at all? And how cou'd a Perſecutor publiſh ſo gracious an Edict in favour of his Enemies? I was too forward in my Anſwer to that Diſcourſe, in wholly giving up MARCUS *for a Bigot aud Perſecutor. I was led into it, I muſt own, by relying too much on what you ſaid in the ſecond Section of your fourth Article. But having ſince more carefully examin'd* ANTONINE's *Edict, the Chriſtian Apologiſts, the Acts of the Martyrs of* Lyons, *and of* Aſia, *&c. I am convinc'd that* MARCUS *was not ſo great a Bigot as you repreſent him; nor of himſelf a Perſecutor, as I ſhall ſhew in my Anſwer to* Article IV.

Ad § 5. *I ACKNOWLEDGE that you have clear'd the Point, that Chriſtians are not to be underſtood under the Notion of* Chaldæans. *There was no neceſſity for ſuch a tragical Outcry as you make, in ſaying I had offer'd the greateſt Violence*

Violence imaginable to CLAUDIAN's *Words, ſeeing the Words I make uſe of are not ſo much* CLAUDIAN's *as* LAMPRIDIUS's, Carminibus & Conſecratione. *The firſt of which is particularly us'd by* PLINY, *in the Account he gives of the Worſhip of Chriſt by the Chriſtians; and the ſame manner of Worſhip might be then us'd by them in the time of their Diſtreſs.*

Ad § 6. *TRUE, 'tis no advantage to my Cauſe that* ANTONINUS *wrote to the Senate, nor was it unuſual for the Emperor to write; but his taking the Title of* Imperator *upon him, without a Decree of the Senate, was unuſual: and it is of the greateſt Conſequence and Advantage to my Cauſe, to have him acknowledge that he receiv'd it from God.*

Ad § 7. *I CAN'T underſtand for what Reaſon you ſhou'd interpret the Words,* peregrinos ritus (in Capitol. *c.* 13.) *Magical Sacrifices, ſeeing you your ſelf, in the fourteenth Section of your Defence of the ſecond Part of the firſt Article, are pleas'd to conſtrue* externa Sacra, *the Chriſ-*

tian and Jewiſh *Religions; which, you ſay,* TACITUS *undoubtedly means by theſe Words. But what difference there is between* peregrinos Ritus, *and* externa Sacra, *I know not. The Expreſſion annex'd,* undique Sacerdotes acciverit, *gives me ground to believe thoſe Rites were Chriſtian: ſince he made uſe of Prieſts from all Quarters, foreign Rites, and Luſtrations of all ſorts, I don't ſee why the Chriſtian Worſhip of the ſupreme God ſhou'd be excluded; eſpecially when the Terror of the* Marcomannick *War was ſo great, that it put the Emperor upon all ways of expiating and atoning the Deity, even that immortal one whom the Chriſtians ador'd: as in all probability we may conclude he did, from the Conſideration of that ſevere Reproof he gave his Heathen Subjects for their Impiety, in times of extreme Calamity, as his Edict does evince.*

Ad § 8. *THE* Jupiter Pluvius *you ſuppoſe in the Monument, is only the Image of* AUSTER, *thus deſcrib'd by* OVID,

—madidis

——madidis Notus evolat alis
Terribilem picea tectus caligine vultum, *&c.* *Met. Lib.* 1.

Mercurius Aerius *I take it be no other than the Emblem of the quick Interpoſition of Providence, in delivering* ANTONINE's *Army.*

ARTICLE IV.

Ad § 11. *I CAN'T but think* WITSIUS *in the right, in attributing the Perſecutions of the Chriſtians to popular Tumults. That of* Lyons *you own to have ſo begun. That in* Aſia, *wherein* POLYCARP *ſuffer'd, ſeems to be from the ſame Cauſe; the Gentiles and* Jews *roſe with one accord againſt the Chriſtians, crying out* Αἶρε τὺς ἄθεους. *And that when* MELITO *wrote his Apology, was of the ſame nature; for he calls it* Δημώδης λεηλασία, *and ſays in the end of his Apology, that they were perſuaded the Emperor, who was much more graciouſly inclin'd to the Chriſtians than his Predeceſſors, wou'd yield to their Requeſt;*

which was, that they might be no longer perſecuted by the People. You urge, that MARCUS *wou'd never ſuffer ſuch barbarous Outrages to have been committed in contempt of his own Edicts and Commands. But how, ſay I, can you imagine that he cou'd command contrary to his own Edicts, which is more prepoſterous? You may ſuppoſe they were revok'd, or new ones to the contrary publiſh'd. If ſo, where are they to be found, or what mention is there made of them in any Author? Not the leaſt footſtep of ſuch a thing remains, but rather the contrary; for* MARCUS *declar'd in his firſt Edict, that he follow'd his Father's ſteps in favouring the Chriſtians: And in his Prayer to the Giver of Life, cited by* THEMISTIUS, Orat. 15. *that he never took away the Life of any man. And* CAPITOLINUS *ſays,* c. 8. *that in him* Lenitatem Pii nemo deſideraret; *and* DIO, *p.* 813. *that he was ſo merciful that he delighted not even in the Blood of Gladiators. Now ſince, in his own Edict, he condemn'd thoſe who perſecuted the Chriſtians, and the Chriſtians accuſe him not of Perſecution, and the Gentiles excuſe him*

him of all Bloodshed, we may fairly conclude that he was not guilty of persecuting the Christians.

Ad § 12. *How you can infer from the bare mention of the* Obstinacy *of the Christians, that there was then a Persecution afoot against them, I can't imagine; or why you shou'd render* ψιλὴ παρατάξις *a* brutal Obstinacy, *when the natural Construction of the Words is only a* mere *or* simple Obstinacy; *the same with the* inflexibilis obstinatio *of* PLINY, *and* LUCIAN's *steadiness to Principles, which is part of that just and noble Character given them by those Authors; and yet in* ANTONINUS *is the Description of a Company of mad desperate Enthusiasts, who sacrific'd their Lives out of a sullen Stubbornness. Suppose, however, this shou'd be the purport of the Words, the Christians then meant must be the Hereticks, who press'd forward to Martyrdom, but were condemn'd by the Orthodox Christians, who were always prepar'd with the greatest Firmness of Mind to suffer, yet never sought it: tho when it was their Fate they underwent the severest Torments*

with that true Bravery of Soul, which MARCUS *deſcribes; of which* IGNATIUS, POLYCARP, *&c. are notable Inſtances.*

ARTICLE VI.

Ad § 1. *YOU ſay,* I have not offer'd any thing to prove the Deliverance of the *Romans* to be a ſupernatural Event. *I thought indeed the Argument I made uſe of from the univerſal Agreement of both Chriſtian and Pagan Writers about the Miraculouſneſs of the Fact, without the leaſt Contradiction of any antient Author, was ſufficient to convince an unprejudic'd Perſon, that there was, at leaſt, ſomething ſupernatural in it; which, I ſaid, the drawing up the particular Relations of the Writers of both Parties wou'd evince. But what the Chriſtians have written, you reject as pious Fraud; or, in your own words, as* the Fictions of ſuch as made no ſcruple of lying for the Honour of their Religion. *The Gentiles, indeed, you honour with the Title of* candid and impartial Writers; *and amongſt them,* DIO *you eſteem* the beſt Guide,

Guide. *In this I'll cloſe with you, and agree that the Truth of the Miracle ſhall ſtand or fall by his Account of the Fact. Let us then impartially conſider what he ſays. In the Preface to the Relation he has theſe Words:* An unexpected Victory happen'd to them, or rather was given them by God. *In the middle theſe:* A great deal of Rain fell, not without the help of God. *Again, in the end he gives this wonderful Account:* That the Fire which fell from Heaven, with the Rain, did not touch the *Romans*; or, if it chanc'd to light among them, 'twas ſoon extinguiſh'd. Nor was the Rain of any benefit to the Enemies, but flam'd upon them as Oil, ſo that they deſir'd Water in the midſt of Rain. Some of them wounded themſelves to quench the Fire with their Blood; others ran among the *Romans*, as if the Water was helpful to them alone. This mov'd MARCUS to have Compaſſion on them; upon which he was the ſeventh time ſaluted Emperor. But tho it was not uſual to take the Title before 'twas decreed him, yet he receiv'd it as given him by God; of which he wrote the Senate. *This is the wonderful part*

of

of the Story which DIO *relates; and if this be not a Miracle, I know not what is. For Fire to burn one Parcel of Men, and not hurt another, tho falling at the ſame time upon them; and Water likewiſe to burn as flaming Oil upon ſome, and refreſh others in the very ſame Inſtant, is as much a ſupernatural Event as the three Childrens coming unhurt out of the fiery Furnace. Now, Sir, can you ſay that* DIO *was a candid and impartial Writer? and can you be ſo partial as not to believe him, or ſo unbelieving as to impute it to Magick, according to the vulgar Report, (as our Author calls it?) Or will you recant your Character of him, and throw him among the* Legendary Romaniſts? *For, if his Account be falſe, there is not a greater* Legend *in all the* Roman *Writers, whether antient or modern: But if it be true, there remains no room for Diſbelief. The only Diſpute then muſt be between Gentiles and Chriſtians, whether their God or our God was the Worker of the Wonder.*

Ad § 3. *THE Paſſage againſt multiplying of Miracles, you ſay, was wrote*

with a juſt Indignation to ſee the Dignity of God Almighty ſo meanly proſtituted upon every low and trifling occaſion: and to this end you cite HORACE,

Nec Deus interſit, *&c.*

Certainly you can't quarrel with this Occaſion, as unworthy of God's interpoſing, if you do but conſider how great and good an Emperor, and how vaſt an Army was ſav'd; and how forlorn a Condition they were in, without all proſpect of human Aſſiſtance. Then the Circumſtances of the Empire were ſo bad, that they cou'd not well be worſe under a good Prince. The Treaſury was ſo exhauſted, that MARCUS *was forc'd to ſell the Imperial Furniture to ſupply his Neceſſities, and ſupport the Army. The Peſtilence was ſo outrageous, that it deſtroy'd infinite numbers both of Soldiers and Citizens; ſo that the Army was forc'd to be recruited after an unuſual manner, with Slaves, Gladiators, Robbers, and even* Aſiaticks, Capitol. *c.* 21. *(which, by the way, is contrary to your Aſſertion, that there were no* Aſiaticks *in the Army.) The fear of the People was*

ſo

ſo great, at the Apprehenſion of the Marcomannick *War, that all imaginable Means were us'd to leſſen their Terrors: No God left unworſhipp'd, no kind of Rite unperform'd, no ſort of Expiation untry'd. Now, after all this train of Suffering, of Fears, and eminent Dangers, is it not* dignus Deo vindice nodus, *to ſave after ſo wonderful a manner, by the means of a parcel of poor deſpis'd contemptible Chriſtians, (which might then come into the Army, when* MARCUS omni diligentia paravit Legiones ad Marcomannicum bellum) *to ſave, I ſay, ſo pure, ſo pious, ſo merciful a Prince as* ANTONINUS, *and ſo mighty a People as the* Romans, *in the utmoſt Extremity, when their invincible Courage cou'd do nothing to their Relief? Such is the time for the Almighty to exert himſelf, to convince the World that the Weakneſs of God is ſtronger than all the Power of Man.*

N. 2. *You ask,* what wiſe end of Providence cou'd be anſwer'd by this Miracle, ſince it made not one ſingle Convert to Chriſtianity? *Nor did that famous one*

at

at Jeruſalem, *in the time of* JULIAN, *that I ever heard of. Yet both had their wiſe ends; the one to convince* JULIAN, &c. *that Chriſt was a true Prophet, the other to convince the* Romans *that the Power they deſpis'd was far ſuperior to what they put their Truſt in.*

Ad § 4. *SINCE you have ſo far exploded the antient Apologiſts, and Fathers of the Church, as to repreſent them as Promoters of fraudulent Stories, and as falſe and precarious Reaſoners; and likewiſe the Moderns as Revivers of old Fables, and as Diſputers upon unfair Topicks, and unfit to vindicate the Cauſe of Chriſtianity, it becomes you, nay, 'tis your indiſpenſible Duty, to imploy all your Wit, Reaſon, and Learning, to accompliſh what they have fail'd in, not only by anſwering the Cavils and Objections of the* Deiſts, *and expoſing thoſe Scorners and Contemners of our bleſſed Saviour (no Man being more able and fit to do it than you) but alſo by the ſtrongeſt Arguments to prove the Truth of our holy Religion, to convince all Gainſayers, and to confirm the Wavering; which, as*

you

you are a Lover of Truth, and a ſincere Chriſtian, you ought to do to the utmoſt of your Ability. Beſides, the great God of Heaven and Earth will require this at your hands, to whom he has given theſe ineſtimable Talents of Underſtanding and Knowledge, to be imploy'd in his Service. And, can you imploy them for a better Maſter, and to a better End, than to ſet forth the Glory of him who hath all Power given unto him, both in Heaven and in Earth?

IN fine, upon reading over your Defence, *I muſt freely own it to be writ with a great deal of Wit and Learning. You have actually done by the Story, as the Devil deſir'd to do by St.* PETER, *you have* ſifted it as Wheat. *You have cleanſed off the Chaff, and the Seed of Truth remains; which is this, That there was a wonderful Victory obtain'd over the* Quadi *by* ANTONINE. *That this Victory was the immediate Effect of a Divine Power, is agreed by Writers of all ſorts; which Effect was not the Conſequence of Magick, or of* MARCUS's *Piety, as the Gentiles ſuppoſe, but of the Prayers*

of

of thoſe Chriſtians who were then in the Army, and of the Legion call'd The Thundering, *as the Chriſtian Authors relate: Which Prayers were offer'd up to the* immortal God, *whom* ANTONINUS, *in his Edict, owns the Chriſtians adore; and from whom, he acknowledges in his Letter to the* Senate, *that he receiv'd the Victory.*

LET-

LETTER III.

Mr. MOYLE's *Remarks on Mr.* K——'s *Brief Notes.*

Article I. Part I.

SIR,

Ad § 1. *N.* 1. IF you never believ'd an entire Legion of Chriſtians, why did you go out of your way, and take ſuch Pains to confute my Arguments againſt it? If they are not good, I ſhou'd be glad to ſee better produc'd in their room.

N. 2, 3. I UNDERSTOOD that Sentence of LUCIAN, as you do, to be meant jointly of the *Epicureans* and the *Chriſtians* put together; tho for the Reaſons there alledg'd, I thought the firſt the ſtronger Party. But allowing it to be chiefly meant of the Chriſtians, were not the Words ſpoke, as you own, by ALEXANDER? And was it not his Buſineſs, by increaſing their numbers, to

halloo the *Mob* upon their *Meeting-Houſes*? LUCIAN neither owns nor denies the Fact, but makes the *Impoſtor*, thro'out, an abominable Lyar.

N. 4. *PLINY*'s Letter is not written, as you ſuppoſe, in a ſimple, but a florid rhetorical Style, as all his other Letters, even his moſt familiar ones, are. The *periclitantium numerus* may refer to the *Cum detur pœnitentiæ venia*, &c. for he then did not know the Emperor's mind. But taking it in your ſenſe, does it import more than the *ingens multitudo* of TACITUS, the *quanta manus* of CICERO, or the *multa millia* of LIVY? And is not the *Templa prope deſolata*, beſt explain'd by the *alterum prope populum* of LIVY? Allowing you all you ask, 'tis certain that the far greater part of thoſe Chriſtians apoſtatiz'd; from whence one may conclude, that if the Chriſtians did the ſame in the following Perſecutions, which came ſo thick one upon the neck of another, down to ANTONINUS, the numbers of the *Aſiatick* Chriſtians cou'd not be ſo great as you ſuppoſe, under his Reign. But I can never believe there

was ſuch a monſtrous Apoſtacy, as wou'd follow from your Suppoſition, in an Apoſtolical Age, full of Zeal and Purity; and when St. JOHN was ſtill living in *Aſia*, or newly dead. Indeed under the *Cyprianick* Age (which you make the Model of our *Hierarchy*) many of the Clergy, with the far greater part of the Laity, apoſtatiz'd (*Cyprian. Ep.* xiv.) but I can't think the beginning of the ſecond Century ſo corrupt. This made Mr. DODWELL, ſomewhere in his *Cyprianick* Diſſertations, affirm that theſe Apoſtates were all *Gnoſticks*; who, as we know from St. JOHN in his *Revelation*, had taken deep root in the Churches of *Aſia*, and whom, with JUSTIN MARTYR, I deny to be Chriſtians. This Thought is favour'd by PLINY's diſtinction of the *re-vera Chriſtiani*, &c.

N. 5. 'TIS improbable that the Chriſtians were the five hundredth part of *Rome* under NERO, when I have prov'd they did not exceed the hundred and eightieth part near two hundred Years after. But they muſt exceed, you ſay, the number of eight thouſand, becauſe the burning of

Rome

Rome was attributed to them: But I can't for my ſoul diſcover the force of your Argument, that a City cou'd not be burnt without the help of above eight thouſand hands to ſet it on fire. *London* was fir'd by a ſingle Villain, and *Muſcow* has been burnt more than once by a Pipe of Tobacco.

N. 6. IF you had conſulted JOSEPHUS, (*Antiq.* xvii. 12.) you wou'd have found that he made this Computation of the number of the *Jews* at *Rome*, under AUGUSTUS; and conſequently, by your own Confeſſion, the Argument is very juſt.

N. 6, 7. THE caſe of PLINY the Proconſul, and POSTHUMIUS the Conſul, are exactly alike. The firſt, perhaps to magnify his own Service, ſets forth the number of the Chriſtians in extravagant Terms to his Maſter the Emperor; the other does the ſame by the *Bacchanals*, to his Maſters the People. The one does it in a rhetorical Letter, the other in a rhetorical Speech. PLINY does not ſet down the numbers of the Chriſtians; and for that very Reaſon I have brought theſe

parallel Inſtances, to reduce them to a certainty.

§ 11. I DO not believe, and never own'd, that APOLLONIUS was a Senator, but plainly intimated the contrary. Archbiſhop CRANMER diſſembled his Religion under HENRY VIII. and dy'd a Martyr under Q. MARY. I am glad you own that TERTULLIAN has exaggerated the number of Chriſtian Senators: Why may he not, by the ſame Rule, have exaggerated the number of other Chriſtians in proportion? Is not his *Senatum implevimus* a good Comment on the ἡμισυ πλῆθος of LUCIAN, and PLINY's Epiſtle?

Ad § 5. THE Reaſon you give why *Rome* was call'd the *Eccleſia principalis*, tho the common one, is a Myſtery to me. Was there, at that time, any ſuch Connexion or Relation between Church and State, that the head City of one muſt needs be the principal Church of the other? Don't we ſee, at this day, ſince the Eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity, and the Union of Church and State, that in moſt Governments now in *Europe*, the Seat of

Empire, and the principal Church, are in different Cities, even in *England*, where the chief Magiſtrate is head of the Church? If IRENÆUS has been guilty of an Error about the Antiquity of the *Roman* Church, 'tis common to him with many other Fathers: But that he is ſo to be underſtood, is apparent from the nature of his Argument againſt the Hereticks, drawn (as I remember) from the Antiquity and conſtant Succeſſion of that See; and upon any other Suppoſition, wou'd carry little weight with it. That Maxim is rightly interpreted, as is manifeſt from the Reaſon there alledg'd, of the great Reſort of Chriſtians, *&c.* which muſt of neceſſity make it the moſt populous Church in the Empire. Nor can you give any other turn to that Sentence, without making IRENÆUS an Advocate for the Pope's Supremacy. The Hereticks, you ſay, had fairer quarter there than true Chriſtians: and ſo they had every where elſe; and therefore that Reaſon cou'd never draw them thither.

Ad §7. I COU'D eaſily retort your Charge of ill Memory in Scripture mat-

ters, from ſome pertinent Inſtances ſet down in my *Defence*. But even this Charge from the number of the Epiſtles, (tho I own I did not think of it) is not well made out: For tho St. JOHN wrote to ſeven Churches, 'tis all compriz'd in one * Epiſtle. But even this Argument may be turn'd upon you; for it carries a ſtrong Preſumption with it, that there were but ſeven Churches planted in *Aſia* at the end of the firſt Century, when St. JOHN wrote his *Revelation*, (*Irenæus apud Euſeb. Chron.*) which is a ſmall number (taking the word *Church* in the largeſt ſenſe) for ſo large and populous a Province; much leſs will it prove the Chriſtians more numerous there than in other parts of the Empire; which point you are contending for. The reſt of your Note, being only a Repetition of what you had ſaid before, without taking notice of my Anſwer, I ſhall paſs over.

Ad § 8. THE firſt part of this Note I ſhall conſider at *Article* II.

---

* Rev. i. 4, 11.

THE

THE number of the *Jewiſh* Converts, at the firſt preaching of the Apoſtles, was very great; but they were eaſily prepar'd for the Reception of the Goſpel by the *Miracles* of Chriſt, and their *Prophecies* of the *Meſſiah*: whereas the Heathens knew little of the firſt, and nothing at all of the laſt. Show me an Inſtance of ſuch numbers of Heathens converted by one Sermon, and I'll allow your Argument to be good. I do as much wonder that you ſhou'd ſtrain ſo hard to magnify the numbers of the Chriſtians, beyond all probability; ſince the Progreſs of Chriſtianity, conſidering its late riſe, and the conſtant oppoſition it met with, is, even on my moderate Computation, prodigious, and to be accounted for by nothing but the Divine Providence; as I may one day ſhow at large, on another occaſion.

Article I. Part II.

Ad § 1. NOW, Sir, give me leave to examine your Charge of *Inconſiſtence*, which you enter on with ſuch an air of Satisfaction. Your Objection

had been very juſt, if the Church had been in a conſtant State of Perſecution; which is not true: Or, if CELSUS had accus'd the Chriſtians for not *actually* liſting themſelves in a time of Perſecution. Nor is the Suppoſition true, on which your whole Argument turns, as you might eaſily have ſeen, had you attentively read the whole Paſſage of CELSUS at large, which I only briefly hinted at. He only exhorts them (which implies a Charge that they wou'd not) to bear Arms for the Emperor, ἂν δέωνται, if he call'd for their Service, or if their Service was wanted; which cou'd be only when there was a *Toleration.* And in this ſenſe CELSUS muſt of neceſſity be underſtood, unleſs you'll ſuppoſe him void of common Senſe: For with what face cou'd he accuſe the Chriſtians for not actually ſerving at that time, when he tells them but two Pages before (*p.* 424. and elſewhere) that they were then under a violent Perſecution, that ſtrict ſearch was made after them, and that they were put to death wherever they were found? Can you imagine they were ſuffer'd to liſt, who were not ſuffer'd to live? Cou'd he expect they ſhou'd appear

pear in Arms for the Emperor, who, if they appear'd in publick, were ſure to meet a certain Death? and all this under the Reign of ANTONINUS, who, you ſay, was no Perſecutor? CELSUS was incapable of writing at this ridiculous rate, and conſequently his Charge is only levell'd at the general Principle of the Chriſtians, for declining to ſerve at all times, (even when the Emperor call'd for their Service, and they wou'd have been admitted into the Army) and not at their refuſing *actually* to bear Arms at that juncture; in which ſenſe you muſt have underſtood my Words, had you carefully examin'd my Citation. If after all this, you can diſcern any Contradiction between CELSUS's Charge and my Suppoſition, I ſhall give you joy of the Diſcovery.

N. 2. YOU go on to argue as if CELSUS had been the only direct Witneſs I had produc'd. But han't I brought ORIGEN directly to the ſame fact? Is not the Teſtimony of IRENÆUS and JUSTIN as full and expreſs? And is it not the neceſſary and undeniable Conſequence of the Poſitions laid down by MINUCIUS FELIX,

FELIX, THEOPHILUS, and ATHENAGORAS? Not to name other Proofs, which, tho highly probable, are not of equal weight. So that the Diſpute may be reduc'd to this ſhort Iſſue, Whether the Authority of ſix Witneſſes, (to paſs over CELSUS) five of whom flouriſh'd when the Miracle was wrought, is not infinitely to be preferr'd to the Teſtimony of one credulous Writer, whoſe flouriſhing Age was near thirty Years after. And I wou'd willingly know who treats the *Fathers* with moſt Reſpect, you who give the Lye to ſix of them, or I who give it only to one, who was an Heretick and Enthuſiaſt. 'Tis true, I often quote TERTULLIAN when he relates Facts upon his own knowledge, or that are in their own nature credible, or atteſted by other Writers of good Authority. Am I, for that reaſon, bound to believe all his Caſtles in the Air, and Tales of a Tub?

I AM ſurpriz'd to hear you ſay, that TERTULLIAN charges the Chriſtian Soldiers with no other Act of Idolatry but the Garland. If he had not thought the military Oath idolatrous, how came he

to

to number it among the other kinds of indirect Idolatry, in a Book written expreſly on that Subject? The military Oath, (ſays he) and the baptiſmal Vow, are inconſiſtent with each other, one being the ſign of Chriſt, the other of the Devil: for as they were made Chriſtians by Baptiſm in the name of Chriſt, ſo they were made Soldiers by the military Oath in the name of the Devil; that is, the Heathen Gods by whom they were ſworn. This Interpretation is confirm'd by TERTULLIAN, (*Scorpiac. c.* 4. *ad Martyr. c.* 3, *de Baptiſm. c.* 1, 6.) And does he not immediately paſs on to condemn the Idolatry of all Heathen Oaths? in which number the military Oath muſt be included, which was by the Heathen Gods, as I have ſufficiently prov'd at *§ 6?* And does he not (at *c.* 17.) charge the common Oath of Allegiance, taken by the civil Magiſtrates, with Idolatry? In his Book *de Corona*, (*c.* 11.) he begins in the ſame manner with attacking the Form, and afterwards the Matter of the military Oath. The *Vexillum æmulum Chriſti*, is beſt explain'd by the *Caſtrenſis Religio ſigna veneratur*, (*Apologet. c.* 16.) What ſay you to the following

lowing Sentence, *Cænabit illic ubi Apoſtolo non placet?* Shall a Chriſtian feaſt on the *Idolothyta*, in the Heathen Temples, contrary to the Prohibition of St. PAUL? 1 *Cor.* viii. 10.) This we know to be a common Practice of the Soldiers, from MARCELLINUS, (xxii. 12.) which Paſſage my old Second VALESIUS has rightly explain'd by this parallel Place in TERTULLIAN; and from *Lactantius de morte Perſecutorum*, (*c.* 37.) And was not the eating thoſe Sacrifices expreſly forbid by the Council of *Jeruſalem*, (*Acts* xv.) and reputed by all ſucceeding Ages of the Church, as the higheſt act of Idolatry? What ſay you to the *Solemnis votorum nuncupatio*, at the Place of Arms in the Camp, or in the chief Temples of the Cities where they were quarter'd? (*c.* 12.) Do you think that a Chriſtian cou'd aſſiſt at theſe Solemnities with the Heathens, and comply in all the outward Acts of religious Worſhip without Idolatry? TERTULLIAN tells you, that he paſſes over ſeveral other unlawful *Teſts*, which perhaps might be as criminal as any of thoſe he has inſiſted on. And if theſe *Teſts* were diſpens'd with, as you ſuppoſe,

ſuppoſe, how, in the name of wonder, comes TERTULLIAN to urge them as Arguments againſt the Lawfulneſs of ſerving in the Army? Does he not bid the Chriſtian Soldiers rather ſuffer than conform to them? And how cou'd they ſuffer for *Non-conformity* to *Teſts* that were not requir'd of them? Had they not been rigorouſly exacted of the Chriſtian Soldiers, how came they to excuſe their compliance by the Plea of *neceſſity*? And how admirably well has TERTULLIAN anſwer'd it in that happy turn, *Nulla eſt neceſſitas delinquendi, quibus una eſt neceſſitas non delinquendi?* I hope by this time you are convinc'd that there were other *Teſts* beſides the *Garland*, and that the Heathens were ſo far from being content with the leaſt Act of *Occaſional Conformity*, that the Chriſtian Soldiers were not exempt from the greateſt. That the *Military Oath* in particular was impos'd on them, we know from the Example of BASILIDES, a Chriſtian Soldier, who was put to death under SEVERUS for refuſing it; and thereby diſcovering himſelf to be a true Chriſtian, (*Euſeb.* vi. 4.) And can you imagine it was diſpens'd with in favour

vour of the Chriſtians, whoſe Loyalty was ſo much ſuſpected under that Reign? (*Tertull. ad Scapul. c.* 2.) And when the *Teſts* upon the civil Officers were ſo ſtrictly exacted, (*de Idolo. c.* 17.) I will not repeat what I have ſaid on this head, at *§* 9, 12. of my *Defence*, to which I refer you. 'Tis in vain to ſay the Chriſtians of that Age cou'd not be *Occaſional Conformiſts*, becauſe they had not *ſo learned Chriſt*. 'Tis true, Chriſt did not teach them ſo: But is there a more fallacious way of reaſoning, than to argue from matter of right to matter of fact? The Chriſtians ought not of right to have done ſo, therefore they did not. I expected better Arguments than a bare denial againſt ſuch numerous Examples of this kind, as I had produc'd from ſo many Authors; eſpecially TERTULLIAN, who is not now entertaining his Reader with Dreams, Viſions, Miracles, and Prophecies, but with a ſimple Narration of ſome Corruptions of his Age, which he ſaw every day with his own Eyes; tho I can never believe him ſo far as to think that the Majority of the Chriſtians at that time (*plerique, de Idol.* ii. 14.) had adopted the looſe Prin-

Principle of thinking nothing idolatrous but offering ſacrifice to the Heathen Gods, or being an Heathen Prieſt. This looks like a flight of his uſual Rhetorick; tho 'tis too plain to be deny'd, that too many had given in to that dangerous Doctrine. And when I conſider LUCAN's Character of the Soldiers, which has been found true in all Ages,

Nulla fides pietaſq; viris qui caſtra ſequuntur:

And when I reflect on the famous Converſion of JULIAN's Army, by a ſhort Speech of the Emperor JOVIAN, (*Ruſinus* ii. 1. *Socrates* iii. 22.) I am perſuaded that TERTULLIAN has done them no wrong.

YOU have no Reaſon to ſay that I own'd ANTONINUS's Reſcript to be genuine. 'Tis true, I urg'd it as *Argumentum ad hominem* againſt you, becauſe you had own'd it; but did I not tell you, at the ſame time, that its Authority might be juſtly queſtion'd, tho I allow'd it as antient as TERTULLIAN? I will now freely

freely declare my mind, that I think it the moſt barefac'd, ſelf-evident Forgery in all Antiquity, for theſe following Reaſons.

IT bears date in the firſt Year of ANTONINUS. Now we all know that ANTONINUS, that moment he came to the Crown, made his Brother VERUS Partner of the Empire, and AUGUSTUS; and conſequently the Edict, were it genuine, ought to have run in both their Names. Nor was the Style of ARMENIACUS, which appears in the head of the Edict, aſſum'd by ANTONINUS till the third Year of his Reign, as appears from all the *Medals*; for his Victories in *Armenia* were not won till that Year. PAGI, to evade theſe Difficulties, which he was very well aware of, changes the Date of the *Trib. Pot.* from XV to XXIII, which is coincident with the ninth Year of his Reign, in which his Brother VERUS dy'd. But this is an arbitrary Correction, and againſt the Faith of all the Manuſcripts. Nor will it ſerve his turn; for if it was publiſh'd before the Death of VERUS, my firſt Argument will conclude as ſtrongly againſt the ninth, as the firſt Year of ANTONINUS.

TONINUS. If 'twas publiſh'd after his Death, the Difficulty is ſtill as great; for how then comes the Title of *Armeniacus* there, ſince we are ſure from CAPITOLINUS (*c.* 12.) that after the Death of VERUS he aſſum'd no other Title than that of GERMANICUS, and quitted his old ones? Theſe external Proofs will admit of no tolerable Anſwer, but the internal ones are far ſtronger. Is it poſſible to conceive that a Heathen wou'd have ſet forth the Excellency of Chriſtianity, and the Chriſtians, in ſuch high and rhetorical Terms? CONSTANTINE the Great, in his celebrated Edict, hath not ſaid half ſo much in their Praiſe. All the fine Sentences you have pick'd out of this Epiſtle, are ſo many Proofs of its being ſpurious, and ſhew it cou'd have been compos'd by none but a Chriſtian. This ſingle Argument induc'd Mr. DODWELL, who was never tax'd with want of Credulity, to give it up, (*de paucit. Martyr. ſub Antoninis.*) And GER. VOSSIUS has written a little Diſcourſe on purpoſe to prove it an Impoſture, which I am ſorry I can't meet with. Not to mention later Writers of leſs Name, who have paſs'd the ſame

Cenſure upon it: So that you ſee I am not ſingular in my Opinion.

TO all the excellent Qualifications of the Chriſtian Soldiers, you had forgot to give the finiſhing ſtroke by adding one Circumſtance, that they held fighting unlawful; which I ſhall take for granted, till you diſprove my Arguments by better Authorities than the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*, which are Forgeries, and CLEMENS and St. BASIL, who turn upon you. To which I ſhall add an Inſcription in the *Roma Subterr.* which has eſcap'd you, of a Chriſtian Soldier martyr'd under ADRIAN. But CUPERUS has long ago paſs'd a juſt Cenſure on this Inſcription; and the Cheat is ſo obvious, that Mr. DODWELL thought it below him to take notice of it in his Remarks on the Martyrs of that Reign. The *Prieſts* find their account in forging ſuch Inſcriptions, to raiſe the market of their *Reliques:* And Biſhop BURNET's Diſcourſe on the *Catacombs* will give light to this Obſervation. If you think I have miſtaken, or miſrepreſented the ſenſe of the primitive Fathers in this Article, I deſire you, ſince you

are

are ſo apt to preſs me with the Authority of great Names, to conſult Biſhop FELL's Notes on the larger Epiſtle of CLEMENS to the *Corinthians*; where you'll find all I have ſaid on this Subject, confirm'd by that learned Prelate. And to ſhow you that I am not ſingular in my opinion of theſe *Teſts*, the ſame Biſhop, in his Notes on the Paſſion of MAXIMILIAN, (who ſuffer'd Martyrdom under DIOCLESIAN, long before the Perſecution broke out, for refuſing to ſerve in the Army) has this remarkable Expreſſion, (*p.* 43.) *Militiam videtur detrectâſſe ob ſacramentum militare nomine falſorum numinum aut Imperatorum conceptum, aut adoranda ſigna.* Dr. CAVE (*Primitive Chriſtianity* *) ſays, the Chriſtians ſometimes declin'd ſerving in the Army, becauſe there were commonly ſuch Conditions requir'd of them as were inconſiſtent with Chriſtianity. Theſe are his Words as near as I can remember, for I han't the Book by me; and never read it, no more than I had Biſhop FELL's Remarks, before I had written my firſt Diſcourſe.

* Part I. c. 3. p. 53. 4th Edit.

I SAID, *the foot you put your Argument upon was begging the queſtion*, &c. To this you reply, that you only took what I granted, *that there were Chriſtians in the Army of* SEVERUS. But to have made this Anſwer of any weight, you ſhou'd have prov'd that I own the Conſequence you had drawn from it, or that the Conſequence was neceſſary, *viz.* That any of the Chriſtian Soldiers in SEVERUS's Army, at the date of TERTULLIAN's Book *de Coron.* which you ſay (in your *Anſwer*) *was above thirty Years after the Affair in debate*, (that is, the Miracle) were preſent in ANTONINUS's Army, at the time of the Miracle. But this Conſequence is ſo far from being neceſſary, that 'tis not ſo much as probable; for every body knows that the Soldiers, after twenty Years Service, had the Privilege of being diſcharg'd, as they commonly were, with a noble Reward; and conſequently were not likely to ſtay in the Army ſo many Years after their full term was expir'd, (*Suidas in* Βετρανίων, *Dio p.* 606.) So that my Charge of begging the queſtion, is rather ſtrengthen'd by your *Defence*.

SINCE

SINCE you refuſe to acquieſce in the fair and eaſy Solution I had given of this pretended Contradiction, I'll try once more to convince you, by laying down the whole Propoſition, if poſſible, in plainer Terms. The Chriſtian Soldiers comply'd with ſome idolatrous Teſts, which they did not believe idolatrous; but refus'd to offer Sacrifice, which they knew to be idolatrous. The Papiſts are every day guilty of Idolatry in worſhipping the Hoſt, tho they don't think it ſo; but not a man of them wou'd worſhip an *Indian Pagod*, which he knows to be Idolatry. So that there is no manner of Contradiction in this Propoſition, unleſs you'll ſuppoſe the moſt abſurd thing in nature, that a man who might commit a Sin of Ignorance, wou'd of courſe be guilty of a Sin of Preſumption.

ARTICLE II.

I CAN ſay nothing to your Objection from SALMASIUS, becauſe I have not his large Notes on the *Hiſt. Auguſtæ Script.* but only an Abridgment of them

by SCHREVELIUS, in which no notice is taken of this Legion. I have us'd MELITENE and MELITINE promiſcuouſly, becauſe the Antients had done ſo before me; tho I think the firſt Reading the beſt, becauſe it has the Authority of PLINY, STRABO, TACITUS, and all the old Writers, I think, except JOSEPHUS. MARCELLINUS, and the *Hiſtoria Miſcell.* uſe the laſt Reading, tho JUSTINIAN and the *Notitia* prefer the firſt. But 'tis plain by their Deſcriptions of it, that they all mean the ſame Place, *viz.* a little Region in *Aſia*, on the *Euphrates*, that had, at leaſt as early as TRAJAN, a City of the ſame name. The old Geographers place it in *Cappadocia*, but moſt part of the later in *Armenia minor*; becauſe, at different times, it was annex'd to theſe different Provinces, and *Armenia minor* it ſelf was comprehended under *Cappadocia* in the largeſt ſenſe of the Word. This little difference has, however, given a handle to ſome unskilful Geographers, to make two MELITENES in thoſe Parts.

I HAD trac'd the *Legio 12ma Fulmin.* down to the Siege of *Jeruſalem*, and fix'd

fix'd it in *Cappadocia* on probable Conjectures; for which I have now a poſitive Proof from JOSEPHUS (*de bello Jud.* vii. 19. *p.* 971.) who ſays, 'twas remov'd by TITUS from its old quarters in *Syria*, to *Melitine* on the Borders of *Cappadocia* and *Armenia*. There DIO places it in his time, and the *Notitia*, and PROCOPIUS long after give it the ſame Quarters: And I do intirely agree with you that its Quarters were fix'd there for ſeveral Ages, and we never hear of it any where elſe. In like manner the *Legio* XV. *Apollin.* poſted by VESPASIAN in the ſame Province, was quarter'd there in DIO's time, and when the *Itinerary* of ANTONINUS was written, (*p.* 11.) and as low as the *Notitia*.

I AGREE with you, as I own'd in my *Defence*, that the *Aſiatick* Legions were imploy'd in *Aſia*; and your Conjecture, that they were recruited in the Countries they were poſted in, and the adjacent Provinces, is as certain from TACITUS, (*Ann.* xiii. *c.* 7, 35.) and conſequently in few Years they muſt be all compos'd of *Aſiaticks*. The ſtanding Force of

Aſia, under TIBERIUS, conſiſted of four Legions, all quarter'd in *Syria*, (*Tacit. Ann.* iv. 5.) To which VESPASIAN added two Legions poſted in *Cappadocia*, (*Suet. in Veſpaſ. c.* 8.) So that the Legions of *Aſia* were but ſix in number, all quarter'd on the *Parthian* Frontiers; which is very conſiſtent with what I ſaid in my *Defence*, that *Aſia* was not the Nurſery of the *Roman* Legions, ſince not the ſixth part of them were rais'd or recruited there. We are both well agreed that the *Melitenian* Legion of EUSEBIUS is the 12*ma Fulmin.* And from all theſe Premiſes, I do infer that this Legion was not preſent at the Miracle.

IN the firſt place I have prov'd it an *Aſiatick* Legion, and that 'twas conſtantly quarter'd at *Melitene* for above three hundred Years, and never heard of any where elſe. In the next place, tho it was very uſual in the *Parthian* Wars to remove the Weſtern Legions into *Aſia*, and all ANTONINUS's Victories over the *Parthians* were won by his *European* Troops, as appears from his own Speech, (*Dio p.* 812.) yet I don't remember one Example in thoſe

thoſe times of the Eaſtern Legions being brought to ſerve in the Wars with the Northern Nations. Such effeminate Troops might be fit enough to encounter the *Parthians* on their own Dunghil, who at a cloſe Fight, or in a mountainous Country, were no greater Heroes than themſelves, (*Lucan.* viii. 370, *&c.*) but were never thought a match for the *German* Arms and Bravery, as appears from the Character given them by SEVERUS and ANTONINUS, which I have produc'd in my *Defence*, and from a Letter of that laſt Prince, (*Vulcatius in Caſſio, c.* 5.) and from TACITUS, (*Ann.* xiii. 35.) This was the conſtant Reputation of the *Syrians* in all times. LIVY (xxxvi. 17.) ſtyles the *Aſiatick Greeks*, and the *Syrians* in particular, *genera hominum ſervituti nata*, which is confirm'd by CICERO, (*de Prov. Conſul. c.* 5.) Nor was the Courage of their Neighbours the *Cappadocians*, where the two other Legions were quarter'd, in higher eſteem. To paſs over the Proverb of the τεία κάππα κάκιστα, and that their Country only paſs'd among the *Romans* for a Nurſery of Slaves and Knights of the Poſt, (*Hor. Ep.* vi. *v.* 39. *Juv.* vii. 15. *Perſius*

ſius vi. 77. & *ibid. Schol. Martial* x. 76. vi. 77. *Cic. poſt redit. in Sena. c.* 6.) There needs but one Inſtance to give you a taſte of their Proweſs and great Hearts, that they are the only People on record (except the ungrateful *Iſraelites*, who were ſharply reprov'd for their Folly by their good old Prophet) that when Liberty was offer'd them, imbrac'd Slavery, not out of conſcience, but out of choice, (*Strabo* xii. *p.* 540. *Juſtin* xxxiii. 2.) The *Thundering Legion* in particular, inſtead of being famous for doing Wonders with their Swords, ſeems as well qualify'd for the Practice of *Non-Reſiſtance* as the *Thebæan*. Under NERO they made a ſhameful Submiſſion to the *Parthians*, (*Tacit. Ann.* XV. 14.) and if we may believe SUETONIUS, (*in Nerone, c.* 39.) were diſmiſs'd with Ignonimy under the Gallows; and for their Cowardiſe, in the beginning of the *Judæan* War, were remov'd from *Syria* to *Melitene*, (*Joſeph. p.* 971.) And is it likely that ANTONINUS wou'd venture the Fortune of the Empire in the hands of ſuch wretched Troops, againſt the moſt fierce and fearleſs People in the World? Nor, had theſe Legions been ever ſo brave,

cou'd

cou'd they have been drawn out of *Aſia* at that Juncture, without expoſing the whole *Eaſt* to manifeſt Danger. For in the beginning of the *Marcomannick* War, the *Arabians* were in Arms againſt the *Romans*, (*Vulcat. in Caſſio c.* 6. *Marcellinus* xiv. 4.) *Egypt* was in open Rebellion, (*Capitol. in Antonino, c.* 21.) and a new War with *Parthia* was on the point of breaking out, (*c.* 22.) And the Emperor was ſo far from calling Troops from that quarter, that he reinforc'd the ordinary Guard of *Aſia*, by poſting ſome Legions in *Bithynia*, (*Capitol. in Albino c.* 6.) tho at other times *Bithynia* was a *Proconſular*, not an Imperial Province, and conſequently had no Army to defend it, (*Dio p.* 505. *Strabo p.* 840.) Nor has the Author of the forg'd Edict of ANTONINUS, reckon'd this among the other Legions which were preſent at the Miracle, tho he has nam'd them all. And I have a ſtrong Suſpicion from the fragment you tell me of GREGORY NYSSEN, that he lays the Scene of this Miracle not in *Pannonia*, as every body elſe does, but in that Province where he ſays the Legion was quarter'd,

ter'd, which, I think, you wrote me was in *Cappadocia*.

ALL theſe Arguments I have added *ex abundanti*; for I have ſufficiently demonſtrated in my *Defence*, (*Art.* 1. § 8.) from ANTONINUS's own Speech, that there were no *Aſiatick* Legions in his Army, at the time of this Miracle, and conſequently that this Legion was not preſent at it. And if this be true, what becomes of the Credit, not only of this Article, but of the whole Miracle? The Miſtake of EUSEBIUS is eaſily accounted for: He had heard that a Legion was ſirnam'd from this Victory; and finding no other *Thundering Legion* on the Liſt but that quarter'd at *Melitene*, he gave it the honour of the Miracle, as well he might, without farther Examination; tho, to do him juſtice, he believ'd nothing of the matter. And I make no doubt that this Miracle was ſo far from giving the name to the Legion, that the name of the Legion gave a riſe to this Circumſtance of the Miracle. After this, I need not take notice of your Conjecture, that the ſame Legion was chriſten'd twice by the ſame

ſame name. I preſume you don't lay ſuch ſtreſs upon it as to think it requires any Anſwer. How much more candid had it been to give up a Point never to be maintain'd, than to defend it by ſuch chimerical Gueſſes?

N. 2. YOU agree with me in ſuppoſing that EUSEBIUS miſtook in his Quotation of APOLLINARIS; that is, as I underſtand you, that he has cited him by miſtake, inſtead of the Author from whom he took this Relation, which is all I contend for.

BUT what if I can prove, after all, from TERTULLIAN himſelf, that there were no Chriſtians at that time in the *Aſiatick* Legions? nothing is more eaſy. In his Diſcourſe addreſs'd to SCAPULA, (*c.* 2.) in order to vindicate the Loyalty of the Chriſtians, he has this remarkable Expreſſion, —*tamen nunquam Albiniani, nec Nigriani, vel Caſſiani inveniri potuerunt Chriſtiani.* CASSIUS, every body knows, rebell'd the Year after the date of this Miracle, and was Maſter of *Syria*, with its four Legions. This ſhows there

were no Chriſtians in thoſe Legions; for if there were any there, they either continu'd in the Service, or quitted it on the revolt of CASSIUS: If the firſt be true, how cou'd TERTULLIAN acquit them of the charge of *Rebellion*, and what becomes of their Paſſive Obedience? And the laſt can never be true, for 'twas impoſſible for TERTULLIAN to omit a Circumſtance ſo glorious to the Chriſtians, and ſo full a Vindication of their Loyalty. Now if there were no Chriſtians in the Legions of *Syria*, (where you make them ſo numerous, and where I believe they were as numerous as in any part of the Empire, except *Rome* and *Africa*) this cou'd never be the effect of Chance, but of Principle. And the ſame Principle wou'd have hindred them from liſting in the *Cappadocian* Legions. This Argument may be carry'd further: for if there were no Chriſtians in the Army of NIGER, who was Maſter of all the *Aſiatick* and *Egyptian* Legions, nor in the Army of ALBINUS, who was Maſter of all the Legions of *Britain*, (both which put together made up more than a third part of the ſtanding Legions of the Empire) 'tis a

jeſt, for the Reaſons already alledg'd, to ſuppoſe there were any in the other Legions. And this confirms my Hypotheſis, that there were no Chriſtians in the Army, till the end of the ſecond Century, at which time ALBINUS loſt his Life and Empire, *viz. A. C.* 198.

ARTICLE III.

Ad § 1. THAT the Heathens thought and ſpoke ill of the Chriſtian Religion, no body doubts. Wou'd you have had them, while they were Heathens, praiſe it in the Style of ANTONINUS's mock Epiſtle, and prefer it to their own? 'Tis enough for my purpoſe, that they did juſtice to their moral Virtues. Is not that a good Argument that they treated them with leſs Paſſion and Bigotry than you ſuppoſe? Cou'd more be expected from a fair Adverſary? LUCIAN, in his *Pſeudomantis*, deſcribes the Chriſtians as mortally hating and hated by the Impoſtor, and joins them thro'out with his beloved *Epicureans* in expoſing his Frauds. And had I not reaſon to ſay that he ſeem'd to treat them with Reſpect?

But

But why is it ſuch a Paradox to quote LUCIAN as *an Inſtance of the Heathens ſpeaking well of the Chriſtians?* Has not HUETIUS (*Dem. Evang. p.* 42.) produc'd his Teſtimony in their favour, even from his *Peregrinus*, the only part of his Works where he directly treats them with contempt, tho at the ſame time he has given them no ill Character as to their perſonal Virtues? He has nam'd them only once more in his *Pſeudomantis*, where he is far from ſpeaking ill of them; and hints at them only once more in his *Philopſeudes*. DIO has nam'd or deſcrib'd the Chriſtians divers times; and the Authors of the *Auguſtan Hiſtory* have done the ſame; and one of them in particular, LAMPRIDIUS, has nam'd Chriſt and the Chriſtians no leſs than ſeven times, and never with the leaſt Reproach. EUNOMIUS was no Heathen, as I thought, but an Heretick; which Miſtake, however, had the good fortune to eſcape you. My Argument from CLAUDIAN lay open enough; but that blot you wou'd not hit, becauſe you had no mind to charge St. AUSTIN and OROSIUS with an imperfect Citation. But how does all this confute

my

my Argument? Have I not prov'd that PORPHYRY, to whom I will add CELSUS and HIEROCLES, all three violent Enemies to Chriſtianity, own'd the Chriſtian Miracles? And why, by the ſame rule, might not DIO, and the other Writers I have nam'd, who were far enough from being *Bigots*, have done them the ſame Juſtice? But to this you are pleas'd to give no Anſwer, much leſs to what follows: and you are much on the right of it.

N. 2. I AM glad you can't contradict me in this Article, without contradicting your ſelf; but I am much gladder to ſee that you have no other Arguments to depend on but the *Reſcript* of ANTONINUS, which I have prov'd a manifeſt Forgery; the Apologiſts of his Reign, which I am ſure are all againſt you; and what is moſt wonderful of all, the *Acta Martyrum Lugdun.* upon which rock Mr. DODWELL has ſplit before you. I am in ſo little pain about any Proofs you can bring on that head, that I am content, if you pleaſe, to reſt the whole Controverſy on this ſingle Article.

Ad § 6. BY the Emperor's owning that he receiv'd the Title of *Imperator* from God, I preſume you mean that he aſcrib'd his Deliverance to Providence; which I never deny'd. But wou'd you infer from his uſing θεὸς in the ſingular number, that he meant God Almighty? Examples without number might be produc'd out of his own Writings, where the word is us'd in the ſame manner for *Jupiter* or *Providence*.

Ad § 7. TACITUS by the *diverſi Ritus*, and *externa Sacra*, means all foreign Religions without diſtinction; in which number the Chriſtian and *Jewiſh* muſt be included, if not chiefly intended; eſpecially the Chriſtian, as appears by the following words, *aut nulla*; for there was no other Sect, or body of Men, publickly accus'd of *Atheiſm* by the Heathens. The *Epicureans* were only conſider'd by the State as a ſpeculative Sect of *Philoſophers*, but ever were reputed of the *National Religion*; becauſe they conform'd, like their Succeſſors the modern *Hobbiſts*, to the publick Worſhip, and no more was ex-

expected. This Opinion is confirm'd by a parallel Place of TACITUS, under the ſame Reign, (*Ann.* xiii. *c.* 32.) *Græcina —ſuperſtitionis externæ rea.* By which words HUETIUS, LIPSIUS, and other Criticks underſtand the Chriſtian Religion to be meant. 'Tis very true that *peregrini ritus*, and *externa ſacra*, are us'd as ſynonymous Terms by the beſt Writers; but there are, by Mr. DACIER's leave, ſuch particular Circumſtances in this Paſſage of CAPITOLINUS, as determine the Words to ſuch a ſenſe as can never be underſtood of the Chriſtians. I ſhall firſt defend my own Explication, and then examine yours. 'Tis manifeſt that the religious Ceremonies there ſpoken of, were us'd not only on the account of the *Marcomannick* War, but of the Plague, as appears from the following Period, and is confirm'd by a parallel Paſſage at *c.* 21. and from the *Lectiſternia* there mention'd; which firſt began on that occaſion, (*Liv.* v. 13. vii. 1, 27.) and were rarely practis'd on any other. The ſame is evident from the Luſtrations or Expiations, which were commonly us'd on theſe Occaſions, as appears from DIONYS. *l.* viii. *p.* 441, 2. *Ed. Steph.*

ANTONINUS ſummon'd Prieſts from all quarters to *Rome*, by reaſon of the great number of Sacrifices which were offer'd at that time; as CASAUBON has rightly interpreted it, by the help of a parallel Paſſage in MARCELLINUS, (XXV. 4.) where he makes a compariſon between the numerous Sacrifices of JULIAN and ANTONINUS, on this very occaſion of the *Marcomannick* War, as appears from the following words, ἀν σὺ νικήσῃς. And 'tis very probable that the Parallel extends not only to the number, but the nature of their Sacrifices. And JULIAN, every body knows, was famous for magical Sacrifices, which MARCELLINUS ſeems to allude to in this ſame place, *Superſtitioſus magis quam Sacrorum legitimus obſervator*. We know from LAMPRIDIUS, (*in Heliogab. c. 9.*) that ANTONINUS, after his Victory over the *Marcomanni*, made uſe of magical Inchantments to ſecure the Peace he had made: And I thought it as reaſonable to conclude that he imploy'd the ſame Arts to prevent the War, or facilitate the Victory, which, you know, the Heathen Writers ſay was won by the help of his *Magicians*. I am confirm'd in this thought by

by the Example of JULIANUS, who reign'd not long after; and to avert the ſtorm he was threatned with from SEVERUS, offer'd magical Sacrifices, *Non convenientes Romanis ſacris hoſtias*, (*Spartian in Juliano*, *c.* 7.) which is a good Comment on the *ritus peregrini* of CAPITOLINUS. This Opinion is render'd probable by the example of his Grandfather ADRIAN, (*Dio p.*797.) VALERIAN, (*Euſeb.* vii. 9.) MAXENTIUS, (*Hiſt. Miſcell.* xi. 6.) JULIAN the Apoſtate, (*Hiſt. Miſcell.* xi. 43.) and many other Emperors; who, upon extraordinary occaſions, made no ſcruple to have recourſe to the ſame Arts. ANTONINUS expiated the City by all kinds of *Luſtrations*, in which number *magical* ones muſt of neceſſity be comprehended, if there were any ſuch; which may be very eaſily prov'd. The earlieſt Inſtance of this kind, that I know of, is EPIMENIDES, who freed *Athens* from the Plague, by the help of ſuch Luſtrations, (*Laertius in Epimenide*, *Pauſan. lib.* 1. *p.* 26.) Neither of theſe Writers, indeed, makes EPIMENIDES a Magician. But SOCRATES (iii. 16.) calls him ἀνὴρ τελεστὴς, and PLUTARCH (*in Solone p.* 154.)

ſaith, he was famous for the πιστικὴ σοφία, which is much the ſame. And APULEIUS expreſly ſays, that he was reputed a *Magician*, (*Apol. p.* 265.) He wrote a whole Book of theſe καθαρμοὶ, or *Luſtrations*, (*Suidas in Epimenide, Euſtath. ad Dionyſ. Perieg. v.* 88. And CLEMENS ALEXANDR. (*Strom.* vi. *p.* 639.) ſays, that by certain Sacrifices he diverted the *Perſian* Invaſion for ſeveral Years. EMPEDOCLES, whom SUIDAS compares with APOLLONIUS, a moſt notorious *Magician*, and who is call'd a *Magician* by PLINY, (XXX. 1.) and by LAERTIUS, (*in Empedoc.*) wrote a Poem of theſe καθαρμοὶ, which Dr. BENTLEY rightly renders Luſtrations of Cities and Countries from Plagues, Prodigies, *&c.* And his Explication is confirm'd by APULEIUS, (*Apol. ibid.*) who ſays, that Book got him the Reputation of a *Magician*. And that he was ſo, is evident from ſome Fragments of his Poems preſerv'd by LAERTIUS, in his Life, and by CLEMENS, (*Strom.* vi. 630.) and from the Character that Father gave of him. CELSUS (*p.* 301.) ſays, there were ſuch Luſtrations for the cure of Diſeaſes, and pretends they were practis'd by the Chriſtians;

tians; which ſilly Calumny is confuted by ORIGEN. CLEMENS has given us the form of one of theſe Luſtrations againſt the Plague, (*Strom.* v. 570.) When APOLLONIUS was accus'd before DOMITIAN, for ſtopping the Plague at *Epheſus* by magical Arts, he juſtify'd himſelf by the Example of many other great Men of Antiquity, (*Philoſtratus* viii. 2. *p.* 395.) 'Twou'd be endleſs to produce Examples of this kind. So that if ANTONINUS expiated the City by all kinds of Luſtrations, as CAPITOLINUS expreſly ſays he did, he muſt of neceſſity make uſe of magical ones among the reſt.

THAT ANTONINUS had recourſe to magical Charms and Spells, on this occaſion, is highly probable from ALEXANDER's Oracle, which was ſpread thro' all parts of the Empire, and fix'd over their Doors as a Charm againſt the Plague; which cou'd never have been done ſo univerſally without the Conſent or Encouragement of the Government. Nor will this ſeem ſtrange to any man who conſiders what Reſpect ANTONINUS paid this Impoſtor, as appears not only in the In-

ſtance I have given in my *Defence* of this Article, but in another which is yet more extraordinary. He had the Impudence to ask ANTONINUS to change the name of *Aboniteichos* into *Jonopolis*: And tho LUCIAN does not tell us the Succeſs of this Petition, yet we are ſure 'twas granted, as appears from a Medal ſtruck under ANTONINUS, which gives the City the name of *Jonopolis*, and which it retain'd many hundred Years after, as low as JUSTINIAN, *Spanhem. de uſu Numiſm. p.* 214.

I SHALL now examine the ſenſe you have given this Paſſage. As to your conjecture about the *Sacerdotes acciverit*, &c. I refer you to CASAUBON's Explication. But to have made this Argument bear, you ſhou'd have prov'd that he not only ſummon'd Prieſts from all quarters, but Prieſts of all Religions; which the Words are far enough from implying. I never heard that ANTONINUS ever apply'd himſelf to the Chriſtian Prieſthood on any other occaſion but his Daughter LUCILLA's being poſſeſs'd by the Devil, which was caſt out of her by ABERCIUS Biſhop of *Hierapolis*. This Story is atteſted and

believ'd

believ'd by ſeveral Writers of great Authority; and 'tis great pity you miſs'd it, ſince 'tis the only Inſtance in all Antiquity that can be brought in favour of your Hypotheſis. But pray what Rites or Ceremonies of the Chriſtians cou'd ANTONINUS perform on this occaſion? I know of none they had, in the old ſenſe of the Words, but the two Sacraments. Baptiſm, I hope, you never will allow him, unleſs you cou'd bring ſome Father, or Church-Hiſtorian for his *God-Father*, that wou'd anſwer for his Chriſtianity. And 'twou'd be indeed profaning the Ordinance with a vengeance to give the other Sacrament to ſuch an *Occaſional Conformiſt* as ANTONINUS, as you make him. Luſtrations of Cities the Chriſtians had none, that I ever heard of; unleſs you'll ſuppoſe that they ſprinkled the City Gates with *Holy-Water*, and march'd about the Streets with the Hoſt in Proceſſion, as the Papiſts do on the like occaſions. But I am in hopes that Popery is not quite ſo old as the ſecond Century.

Dii meliora piis, erroremque hoſtibus illum. Virg. G. 3.

As

As for other Rites and Ceremonies, in the modern ſenſe of the Word, excepting the Croſs, I know of none they had in thoſe times. That Pageantry was reſerv'd for Ages that were aſham'd of the Simplicity of the Goſpel. There remains nothing more, unleſs he deſir'd the Prayers of the Congregation; but he might have known from ATHENAGORAS (*ad finem*) and other Apologiſts, that the Emperors never wanted the Prayers of the Church, under the ſevereſt Perſecutions: and 'tis a jeſt to ſuppoſe that he ask'd their Prayers at *Rome*, while he was burning them at *Smyrna* and other parts of the World; which ſhall be my next Argument.

THE Affair in debate was tranſacted in the beginning of the eighth Year of ANTONINUS, juſt before his firſt Expedition againſt the *Marcomanni*, which was before the middle of that Year. That there was a Perſecution againſt the Chriſtians in the ſixth Year of his Reign, we know from ATHENAGORAS, who wrote his *Apology* that Year. POLYCARP and others ſuffer'd at *Smyrna*, in the ſeventh Year of his Reign, (*Euſeb. Chron.*) And you

you your ſelf fix the Perſecution of *Lyons* to the ſame Year; and 'twas ſo far from being over in the tenth Year of his Reign, that it rag'd with greater Violence than ever, as we know from MELITO, who wrote his *Apology* that Year, (*Euſeb. Chron.*) The Criticks have, with great probability, fix'd the date of TATIAN's *Apology* to the eighth Year of ANTONINUS, as you may ſee in the Preface to the *Oxford* Edition; and that there was then a Perſecution on foot, is manifeſt from *p.* 97. Now 'tis very ridiculous to believe that the Chriſtians were treated with ſuch Reſpect at *Rome*, while they were us'd with ſuch Severity in other parts of the Empire for their Religion, as I ſay, for Murder and Inceſt, as Mr. DODWELL ſays; which Suppoſition does not alter the caſe: For, can any one imagine that the Emperor cou'd entertain any opinion of the Efficacy of their Prayers, whoſe Religion, as he thought, allow'd them in the Practice of ſuch inhuman and unnatural Crimes?

BUT what Religion he had recourſe to, at this juncture, we may beſt judge from

from his Practice on the like occaſion. In the tenth year of his Reign, when the Plague and the *Marcomannick* War broke out afreſh, *Deorum cultum diligentiſſime reſtituit*, ſays CAPITOLINUS, (*c.* 21.) which may be thus render'd, That he reſtor'd the publick Worſhip of the Gods, by perſecuting the Chriſtians, who were for deſtroying it. There are ſeveral concurrent Circumſtances which render this Senſe highly probable. The *Quinquennalia* of COMMODUS's *Imperium Cæſareum*, were celebrated that Year; and all the World knows that at theſe Solemnities the *wholeſome Severities*, as the modern Phraſe is, ran higheſt againſt the Chriſtians. And 'tis as certain that all publick Calamities, which were aſcrib'd to their Atheiſm and Impiety, never fail'd to provoke the Rage of the Government againſt them. Add to this, that MELITO, in his *Apology* preſented that very Year, complains that the Perſecution was carry'd on by virtue of Edicts newly iſſu'd forth. And if my Memory does not fail me, BARONIUS explains this Paſſage in the ſame Senſe. But allowing it to be underſtood in the only other ſenſe the Words are capable of bearing,

ing, *viz.* That he reform'd ſome Neglects and Omiſſions in the publick Worſhip of the Gods; does it not plainly prove that he truſted to his own Gods and his own Religion? and that the ſtraits the Empire was reduc'd to, inſtead of inclining him to Chriſtianity, ſerv'd only to redouble his Zeal for his own Idolatry and Superſtition? To this long Argument I ſhall only add one Remark, That not one Father, or Church-Hiſtorian, ſays a Syllable of this matter; and their univerſal Silence is an unanſwerable Argument againſt you.

Ad § 8. THAT the Winds were drawn with Wings, we all know: But who ever heard that Thunder and Lightning made part of their Equipage? Theſe Enſigns were peculiar to JUPITER, and two or three others of the *Dii majores*, who had the ſole Privilege of thundering, (*Serv. ad Æneid.* 1. *v.* 46.) And the *Roman* Antiquaries, who have ſeen Figures enough of this kind in their Medals, and BASSO RELIEVO's, all concurring to make it the Image of JUPITER PLUVIUS, their Authority, as being the beſt Judges of this matter, ought to be rely'd on. Ju-

PITER

PITER PLUVIUS is often mention'd by the *Roman* Writers, as you may ſee in BARONIUS, and is the ſame with the Ζεὺς ὑετιος of the *Greeks* (*Pauſan.* ii. *p.* 119. *Phurnutus de nat. Deorum, c.* 9.) But allowing your Interpretation to be right, what advantage will you gain by it? The Winds, as well as JUPITER, were all reckon'd Gods by the Antients. They were the Sons of the Goddeſs AURORA, (*Heſiod. Theog. v.* 378. *Serv. ad Æn.* 1. *v.* 136. *Hygini Fab. Præf. p.* 8.) and BOREAS in particular is ſtyl'd a God by OVID, (*Met.* vi. 683.) and VALERIUS FLACCUS, (i. 577.) The *Delphians*, before the *Perſian* Invaſion, by the command of their Oracle, built Altars, and offer'd Sacrifices to the Winds; who, in return, help'd to ruin the Fleet of XERXES, (*Clemens Stromat.* vi. *p.* 630.) BOREAS had Sacrifices offer'd to him by XENOPHON, in his Expedition, (ἀνάβασις iv. *p.* 194. *Ed. Steph.*) had a Temple built to him by the *Athenians*, (*Herodotus* vii. *p.* 283. *Ed. Steph.*) and was worſhipp'd with yearly Sacrifices by the *Thurians*, (*Ælian. Var. Hiſt.* xii. 61.) and by the *Megalopolitans*, (*Pauſan.* viii. 513.) and

had theſe publick Honours paid him by theſe ſeveral States, in memory of ſome *ſignal Deliverances* they had obtain'd in their Wars, by his Aſſiſtance. POMP. MELA, (i. 8.) and his Tranſcriber PLINY, (ii. 45.) make mention of a *Rupes Auſtro Sacra*. Tempeſts, which are nothing elſe but violent Winds, (*Luctantes Ventos, tempeſtateſq; ſonoras, Æn.* i. 57.) were conſecrated by the *Roman* Religion, (*Cic. de nat. Deor.* iii. 20.) and had Temples erected to them, as appears from OVID, (*Faſt.* vi. 193.) and from the famous Inſcription in GASSENDUS's Life of PEIRESKIUS, (*p.* 96.) VIRGIL makes ÆNEAS ſacrifice to the Winds, (*Æn.* iii. 120.) and to the Tempeſts, (v. 772.) and AUGUSTUS dedicated a Temple to *Circius*, a Wind peculiar to *Gaul*, (*Senec. Nat. Qu.* v. 17.) and VESPASIAN built a Temple to the Winds at *Antioch*, (*Malela p.* 339.) ORPHEUS hath a Hymn to the *South* Wind. The Winds are call'd Θεοὶ ἄιδιοι, (*Diod. Eclog. p.* 861.) TIMOLEON beats the *Carthaginians* by Thunder and Lightning, (*Diod. Sic. p.* 470. *Plut. in Timol.*) So that allowing your Obſervation to be right, (which I am far enough from believing)

lieving) what Service will it do your Cauſe? 'Tis indifferent to my purpoſe whether ANTONINUS aſcrib'd his Deliverance to his God JUPITER, or to his God AUSTER, as the *Thurians*, *Megalopolitans*, and *Athenians* had done before him to their God BOREAS.

I AM not concern'd to inquire what Allegories the Philoſophers diſcover'd under the Names and Epithets of the Gods; 'tis enough for my purpoſe that they were all worſhipp'd on the popular Syſtem, and the Fathers always attack'd the Heathen Religion on this foot, and conſequently this Medal, in honour of MERCURY, muſt be ſtruck on the ſame Principle. And upon this Suppoſition, the *Mercurius Aerius* of DIO (who is the ſame with that on the Medal) can be no other than the *Mercurius Supernus* of SERVIUS, and *Cæleſtis* of PLUTARCH, (*de facie in orbe Lunæ*, *p.* 1737. *Ed. Steph.*) in oppoſition to the *Mercurius Infernus*.

A R-

ARTICLE IV. § 11.

ALL my Arguments againſt WITSIUS, you anſwer by the help of the grand *Elixir* of the *Reſcript*, the univerſal Remedy you apply to all Difficulties and Objections. But admitting it for once to be genuine, do you think the Argument concluſive, that if an Emperor once publiſh'd an *Edict* in favour of the Chriſtians, he cou'd never after become a Perſecutor? LICINIUS, in the beginning of his Reign, publiſh'd an Edict in their favour, which is ſtill extant; and we don't hear that 'twas ever formally repeal'd. Wou'd you from thence give the lye to all the Church-Hiſtorians, who make him a violent Perſecutor in few Years after? No Princes were more favourable to the Chriſtians at firſt, than VALERIAN and DIOCLESIAN, who afterward rais'd the bloodieſt Perſecutions againſt them. How can you infer from MELITO, that the Perſecution he ſpeaks of was merely popular? Does he not ſay 'twas rais'd by new Edicts? Were Edicts made by the Mob, or by the Emperor? And were

not theſe Edicts publiſh'd in the tenth Year of his Reign, long after the date of the Reſcript? TRAJAN's Clemency is as much celebrated as ANTONINUS's, and yet we are ſure from PLINY, and the Acts of IGNATIUS, that he was a Perſecutor. ANTONINUS ſays he never took away the Life of any man; that is, illegally or unjuſtly, as he thought: and 'tis ridiculous to underſtand it in any other Senſe. Do you think no Malefactors ſuffer'd under his Reign? What ſay you to my Citation out of CAPITOLINUS, which RUINARTIUS underſtands, and not improbably, of the Chriſtians, in his Preface to the *Acta Martyrum*: in which Place, tho a Papiſt, he has done good Service to the common Cauſe of Chriſtianity, in ſo thorowly confuting Mr. DODWELL's dangerous Hypotheſis, *de paucitate Martyrum*. The reſt of the Arguments I had urg'd on this head, in my firſt Diſcourſe, and in my *Defence*, you paſs over in ſilence.

Ad § 12. MY Argument from this Paſſage of ANTONINUS, was urg'd not as a demonſtrative, but as a probable one.

I am ſtill of the ſame Opinion, for the Reaſons there alledg'd; and you ſee I am not ſingular,

SIMPLE Obſtinacy is Obſtinacy without Reaſon; that is, brutal. Παράταξις ſignifies a good deal more than the Barrenneſs of our Language will expreſs in one Word. It imports, as HUETIUS has very happily explain'd it, (*Dem. Evang. p.* 41.) that the Chriſtians did not ſuffer with a manly rational Courage, but with the brutal Bravery of Soldiers or Gladiators, ſacrificing their Lives without Fear or Wit. And if ANTONINUS thought they ſuffer'd upon no other Principle, he had reaſon to think them Mad-men and Enthuſiaſts. But the Chriſtians he ſpeaks of, *muſt*, you ſay, *be Hereticks, who preſs'd forward to Martyrdom.* What Hereticks? the *Gnoſticks*? They were ſo far from courting the Crown of Martyrdom, that 'twas their Principle not to ſuffer at all. What other Hereticks were there at that time? The *Montaniſts*, who were the boldeſt Sufferers of all the Hereticks, and boaſted moſt of their Martyrs, and the *Encratitæ*, did not ariſe till after

the middle of that Reign. How came ANTONINUS ſo well acquainted with their Character, when they were ſcarce known to the Chriſtians of that time, and IRENÆUS who wrote under COMMODUS has but juſt touch'd upon the firſt of them? What Proofs cou'd they give of their Obſtinacy who were but juſt riſen up, and under a Reign where you deny any formal Perſecution? The other Hereſies, that made any noiſe in the World, were all in a manner *Gnoſticiſm*, parcell'd out into ſeveral little Sects and Subdiviſions, all agreeing in the looſe Principle of complying in time of Perſecutions. *Martyriorum refragatores*, ſays TERTULLIAN, (*Scorpiacon*, *c.* 1.) JUSTIN MARTYR makes it one of the diſtinguiſhing Characters of the Hereticks of his Age, the *Gnoſticks*, *Marcionites*, &c. that they were ſo far from ſuffering Martyrdom, that they never were perſecuted for their Religion, (*Apol.* 2. *p.* 70.) and the Reaſon is very plain from his Dialogue with TRYPHON, (*p.* 253. *Ed. Colon.*) where he tells us they made no ſcruple to eat the *Idolothyta*, &c. So that this Paſſage of

of ANTONINUS can never relate to the Hereticks.

BUT why muſt this Character of voluntary Martyrdom be confin'd only to the Hereticks in the ſecond Century? Were there no Volunteers at that time among the Orthodox Chriſtians? 'Twas the general Character of the Chriſtian Martyrs under the ANTONINI, as you may ſee in LUCIAN's *Peregrinus*, *p.* 567. Under TRAJAN all the Chriſtians in a City of *Aſia* came in a body to the Proconſul ARRIUS ANTONINUS, and offer'd themſelves to the Slaughter. Were they Orthodox or Hereticks? There are many Examples of this kind under the Reign of ANTONINUS, as you may ſee in the Acts of POLYCARP, and ſeveral others in JUSTIN MARTYR, (*Apol.* 1. *p.* 43.) and another among the Martyrs of *Lyons*. And there is good reaſon to infer from the Acts of IGNATIUS, and his Epiſtle to the *Romans*, that he himſelf, the moſt celebrated Martyr ſince the Days of the Apoſtles, was a Volunteer. And theſe Chriſtians, inſtead of being branded as Hereticks, were cry'd up for Heroes. Can

you produce me as many Inſtances of Hereticks who ſuffer'd voluntary Martyrdom before the Reign of ANTONINUS? Can you produce one Inſtance? The Author indeed of the Acts of POLYCARP, does not commend the Practice, but is far enough from calling it heretical. Under the third Century this intemperate Zeal for Martyrdom began to abate; and CLEMENS (*Strom.* iv. *p.* 481.) condemns the Practice in the Orthodox Chriſtians, unleſs they were lawfully call'd to it, and makes it a Character peculiar to a Sect of Hereticks whom he does not name; but by the Deſcription he has given us of them, there is no doubt but he means the *Marcionites*, who were far enough from profeſſing or practiſing that Principle under ANTONINUS, as I have ſufficiently ſhown from JUSTIN MARTYR; and conſequently that Inſtance can do you no manner of Service.

BUT to ſet this whole matter on a right bottom, I will tranſlate the Words of ANTONINUS without any Paraphraſe, *viz. That our Readineſs or Willingneſs to die, ought to be founded on a Principle of*

of Judgment and good Senſe, and not on the ſimple Obſtinacy of the Chriſtians. Have you the leaſt handle to infer from theſe Words, that ANTONINUS ſpeaks rather of voluntary Martyrs, than of any other Chriſtian who had the Courage to ſuffer for his Religion when he was call'd to it? tho I make no doubt but he had both in his eye, and that the Reproach is levell'd at all Chriſtian Martyrs without diſtinction. Does not HUETIUS, and every body elſe, underſtand it in the ſame ſenſe? But give me leave to ask you how this Character of Heretick is conſiſtent with what you ſaid at *Article* I. § 5. that they had *fairer quarter than the true Chriſtians*? How cou'd they diſtinguiſh themſelves by their Obſtinacy in ſuffering, who, upon your Suppoſition, were in ſo little danger of Perſecution? And why the charge of Obſtinacy, in this ſingle Inſtance of ANTONINUS, ſhou'd be apply'd to the Hereticks, when in the only Inſtance you have produc'd beſide, and in many others of the ſame kind which I cou'd produce, 'tis manifeſtly meant of the Orthodox, I am at a loſs to apprehend. I have now ſet this remarkable

Paſſage of ANTONINUS in a true light; and reconcile it, if you can, with the Reſcript you are ſo fond of, or the Edict after the Miracle, & *eris mihi magnus Apollo*. LUCIAN's ſteddineſs to Principles, is very different from the παράταξις of ANTONINUS. In LUCIAN the Chriſtians ſuffer'd in hope of Immortality, and conſequently acted rationally and conſiſtently with their Principles, tho he thought it a miſtaken one. ANTONINUS makes their Sufferings the effect of a ſtubborn poſitive Stiffneſs, without any reaſonable Motive to influence them. Where have I reckon'd the *inflexibilis obſtinatio* of PLINY, as part of his juſt and noble Character of the Chriſtians?

ARTICLE VI.

§ 1. YOU may remember that in the beginning of my firſt Diſcourſe on this Subject, I undertook to examine the Miracle, with all its ſeveral Circumſtances, as 'twas ſtated by EUSEBIUS; and ſince you had not contradicted it, I took it for granted that you join'd iſſue with me on that foot. Nor cou'd I ever imagine

imagine that you wou'd lay aſide the Authority of all the Chriſtian Hiſtorians, and appeal to the Heathens: But I am content to agree with you, to have this Miracle try'd by your own Teſt, the Authority of Dio, provided you'll allow all the other parts of his Relation. But why you ſhou'd ſingle out one Circumſtance of the Story to believe, tho in its own nature ſo very romantick, and not warranted by any one Writer, either Heathen or Chriſtian, and reject his Authority where he has all the Writers of his own Party, and the Authority of two publick Monuments for his Vouchers, is a Paradox never to be reconcil'd to the Rules of fair Reaſoning. If I call'd him a candid and impartial Writer, I meant no more than the very Words, and the whole tenour of my Argument import; that he was no Party-Writer, but had behav'd himſelf like a fair Adverſary in the Controverſy between the Heathens and the Chriſtians. But wou'd you from thence infer, that I allow him the Character of Judgment and Integrity, in all his other Relations; and that I thought him the beſt Guide in the Diſpute to what Religion the Miracle was aſcrib'd

aſcrib'd by the Heathens, becauſe he was back'd by the Pillar and the Medal? So far from it, that I think him in the main a very credulous and ſuperſtitious Writer, as appears in the whole courſe of his Hiſtory. He tells you himſelf that he had written a whole Book of Dreams and Prodigies, *p.* 828. He began his Hiſtory upon the ſtrength of one Dream, (*ib.*) and concludes it with another. He relates more of them upon all occaſions, and lays greater ſtreſs upon them than any Hiſtorian I know of, except Archbiſhop LAUD in his *Diary*. And I can't help rejecting his Authority, in the miraculous part of the Story, becauſe he ſtands ſingle in it againſt the conſent of all the Heathen and Chriſtian Writers, and even the Pillar it ſelf, which is an unanſwerable Argument againſt him: For who can believe that ſo ſignal a Circumſtance as Soldiers burning in the midſt of Rain, wou'd have been omitted in a publick Monument, ſet up on purpoſe to perpetuate, with the other Victories of ANTONINUS, the memory of this Deliverance?

BUT

BUT how, after all, are you ſure that the Circumſtances you lay ſuch ſtreſs on, exceeded all the Powers of natural Cauſes? There are but two of them which have the leaſt Pretence to paſs for ſupernatural, *viz.* That the *Quadi* only ſuffer'd by the Storm; and that the Fire was not extinguiſh'd by the Rain. The firſt Circumſtance is common to all the parallel Inſtances I have produc'd: For how cou'd one Army conquer by the help of the Storm, and the other be ruin'd by it, if both Armies had felt its Fury without diſtinction? For this you may conſult PAUSANIAS, (x. 653.) and LIVY, (xl. 58.) in his Relation of the Lightning that fell on the *Baſtarnæ*, in their Battel with the *Thracians*; *Fulmina etiam ſic undique micabant, ut peti viderentur corpora*,—as if the Lightning had been pointed at them. And how many Examples have we every day of ſingle men ſtruck dead with Thunder, in the midſt of a Croud, and all the by-ſtanders eſcape unhurt? The ſecond Circumſtance, tho it be not expreſs'd, is plainly imply'd in the Inſtance I brought of the Defeat of the *Gauls* at *Delphi*, as you

you may ſee by comparing PAUSANIAS (*p.* 653.) with LIVY (xl. 58.) He there deſcribes the wonderful Storm which ruin'd the Army of the *Baſtarnæ*, and compares it with the Storm at *Delphi*, (*Quali tempeſtate Gallos, ſpoliantes Delphos, fama eſt peremptos eſſe, talis tum Baſtarnas— oppreſſit*) which Words manifeſtly import, that both theſe Tempeſts were exactly alike, and conſequently that every Circumſtance of the firſt was common to the laſt. Now PAUSANIAS tells us, that the Lightning burnt up the *Gauls*, Arms and all, notwithſtanding the violent Shower of Rain and Hail that fell at the ſame time, according to LIVY, JUSTIN, and the Scholiaſt on CALLIMACHUS. And how cou'd the *Gauls*, with their Armour, have been burnt up, if the Flame had been extinguiſh'd by the Rain? And is not this wonderful Circumſtance common to both Relations? For my part, tho as I told you before, I am perſuaded, for Reaſons which will not eaſily be anſwer'd, that this Particular in DIO's Relation, is only a rhetorical Exaggeration; yet allowing the Fact to be true, there are not wanting plauſible Reaſons to prove it might

might have been perform'd by natural Cauſes, if you'll give the ſame Credit to the Teſtimony of the Heathen Writers on other occaſions, as you have done on this.

TACITUS tells us of a light Vapour kindled on the Surface of the Earth, (not an Eruption from its Bowels) which muſt have the ſame material Cauſe with Lightning, that cou'd not be quench'd by Rain, or any other Water, (*Ann.* xiii. 57.) And how many Examples have we of natural Fires burning in the midſt of Water, and increas'd by it, from PLINY (ii. 104, 106.) ARISTOTLE, (*de mirand. Hiſtor. p.* 1153.) CALLIMACHUS, (*frag. apud Bentleium, p.* 335.) But your own Author, DIO, *p.* 174. gives us the moſt notable Inſtance of this kind. 'Tis of a Fire burning in the River *Anas*, and increas'd by Rain; to which he adds ſeveral other ridiculous and incredible Circumſtances, which betray the great Credulity and Superſtition of the Writer. All theſe Inſtances I have produc'd, not as parallel *Miracles*, but as parallel *Lyes*; which prove thus much at leaſt, that the Authority of DIO deſerves

very little Credit on this head, when ſo many other Writers of far greater Weight and Reputation have ly'd before him upon the ſame occaſion. I ſhall paſs over an Obſervation of SENECA, (*Nat. Quæſt. ii. 26.*) which is of greater moment, *Ubi valentior ignis* (*fulminum*) *quam humor eſt, vincit*; which he illuſtrates by ſeveral other parallel Appearances of Nature; the truth of which we have ſeen confirm'd in our own Days. But the Inſtance I chiefly depend on, is a very extraordinary one, full to the purpoſe, which fell out in the compaſs of our own Memories, atteſted beyond all Contradiction, and firſt publiſh'd by Dr. PLOT, in the *Philoſoph. Tranſact.* N° clvii. p. 520. 'Tis a relation of a Clap of Thunder, which broke on an *Engliſh* Ship in *America*, and brought ſome ſulphureous matter along with it, which burnt in the Stern of the Ship, and cou'd not be quench'd by Water or any thing elſe, till the matter it ſelf was ſpent. And why might not DIO's Lightning produce the ſame Effects? At the ſame time there happen'd another Accident yet more extraordinary, which wou'd have appear'd incredible, if it had not been

been confirm'd by another Inſtance of the ſame kind, (*Philoſoph. Tranſact.* N° cxxvii. p. 648.) that the Lightning chang'd the *Poles* of all the *Compaſſes* in the Ship, and gave a new *Direction* to the Needle; which ſhows that every uncommon Effect of Lightning muſt not paſs for miraculous. I have muſter'd up theſe plauſible Reaſons, tho I wou'd not be thought to reſt the ſtreſs of the Argument upon them, to let you ſee that 'twas not wholly impoſſible for this extraordinary Event to have been perform'd by natural Cauſes.

BUT to ſet this matter in a true light, give me leave to examine the ſeveral parts of the Miracle at *Delphi*, and to lay them parallel with DIO's: and then let's try which is the greateſt Miracle of the two, and which is beſt atteſted. The *Delphick* Miracle has the fate of yours, to be told with different Circumſtances by moſt of the Authors who relate it: tho all, who treat expreſly of it, agree in making it a Miracle. The earlieſt Writer I know of that mentions it, is CALLIMACHUS, (*Hymn. in Delum. v.* 171, &c.) who flouriſh'd when it happen'd. To

which I may add his Scholiaſt, with *TROGUS, (xxiv. 8. xxxii. 3.) CICERO, (*de Divinat.* i. 37.) LIVY, (xl. 58.) PROPERTIUS, (iii. 13. *v.* 53.) and PAUSANIAS, (x. 652, 3.) POLYBIUS, who was far enough from being a ſuperſtitious Writer, reckons this Deliverance of *Greece* from the Invaſion of the *Gauls*, to have been very extraordinary: τὸ παραδόξον τῶν τότε γενομένων, (ii. *p.* 171.) tho he mentions none of the Particulars, becauſe he only touch'd upon it *en paſſant*, as ATHENÆUS has done, (*lib.* vi. *p.* 234.) I hope you'll allow theſe Authorities to be very good. I ſhall ſay nothing of thoſe Circumſtances of the Story, which, as I obſerv'd before, are common to both Miracles; but proceed to the others as they are ſet down by PAUSANIAS. That the Ground (only) on which the Army of the *Gauls* was drawn up, was ſhook with dreadful Earthquakes; the Apparition of the Heroes of *Delphi*; Rocks torn from the top of the Mountain, and overwhelming whole Squadrons, as if they had been levell'd at them; the Panick Terror and

* Juſtin.

Mad-

Madneſs that ſeiz'd them in their Retreat; their fancying themſelves attack'd by an Army of *Greeks*, not knowing their Language and Enſigns, and murdering one another for Enemies: and, to crown all, that of this mighty Army, not one ſingle man eſcap'd the Vengeance of APOLLO. Theſe Circumſtances, all put together, are far more extraordinary than yours, and moſt of them better atteſted than the miraculous part of your Story, which reſts on the ſingle Authority of DIO; and conſequently ought to paſs for miraculous as well as yours. If you deny the Facts, by the ſame parity of Reaſon I may deny yours: If you allow them, they muſt be either the Effects of natural Cauſes, or ſupernatural. If you own the firſt, you give up the point in debate: if you grant the laſt, I ſhall turn your own *Dilemma* upon you, that they were wrought by our God or theirs; that is, the Devil. Certainly you can never believe that God Almighty wou'd work a Miracle to preſerve the Oracle of *Delphi*, the Center of the Pagan Idolatry, and the head Quarters of Heatheniſm. If 'twas wrought by the Devil, (which, by Biſhop FLEET-

WOOD's leave, is a very dangerous Suppoſition, and ſtrikes at the root of reveal'd Religion) why might not your Miracle be wrought in the ſame manner, ſince 'tis plain it cou'd ſerve no other ends but the Intereſts of Paganiſm, as I ſhall ſhow in the following Section? I have now bolted this matter to the Bran: and do you think that an indifferent *Critick*, upon a fair compariſon of theſe two Miracles, wou'd not paſs this impartial Judgment, that the Subſtance of the Story is true, and the extraordinary Circumſtances are falſe, in both of them?

YOU have taken a great deal of pains to prove what I never deny'd, that the Empire labour'd under great Difficulties in the Reign of ANTONINUS; tho I am far from thinking them ſo very preſſing, as not to be retriev'd by the common Methods of Providence, without the help of a Miracle. But admitting the Affairs of the Empire to be in as deſperate a Condition as you repreſent them, do you think that a ſufficient Reaſon for God Almighty to work a Miracle? They were in a far worſe caſe under GALLIENUS,

a

a known Patron of the Chriſtians; and under HONORIUS, when the Emperor and Empire were Chriſtian: And yet we never heard that God Almighty, at either of theſe Junctures, thought fit to work a Miracle for their Deliverance. What you add of the Piety of ANTONINUS, that is, his Zeal for his own Idolatry, is a very indifferent Reaſon; and your Suppoſition of the Chriſtian Soldiers, is what I deny, and you'll never be able to prove. Now, Sir, in return, give me leave to ſtate the Fact on my Hypotheſis, and then let's try whether there was ſuch a *dignus vindice nodus*, *The ways of God are unſearchable, and his paths paſt finding out*: but one may venture, without raſhneſs, to affirm, that 'twas inconſiſtent with infinite Wiſdom to work a Miracle for the reſcue of an Army of Idolaters, commanded by a perſecuting Prince; which ſerv'd only to rivet him the faſter in his own Superſtition, and was ſo far from making one Convert, or doing the leaſt ſervice to our Religion, that the Heathens, on the ſtrength of this Deliverance, rais'd Trophies againſt Chriſtianity, ſtruck Medals, and erected Monuments in honour of their

falſe Gods, to whom they univerſally aſcrib'd it. If I believ'd this to be a Miracle, and that the Devil was capable of working a real one, I ſhou'd be apt to conclude, from the only Ends it anſwer'd, that 'twas wrought, as all the Heathen Hiſtorians affirm, by the Charms of the Magicians.

THERE is no manner of parallel between this Miracle and that under JULIAN. In this laſt caſe, the Veracity of God Almighty was concern'd, in order to the Accompliſhment of the Prophecies, to interpoſe in ſo extraordinary a manner. This Reaſon the Church-Hiſtorians have given for it, (*Ruſin.* i. 37. *Sozom.* v. 22.) and St. CYRIL, on the aſſurance of theſe Prophecies, was very confident that this chimerical Project of the *Jews* cou'd never take effect. This Miracle, you ſay, was wrought to convince JULIAN, *&c.* that Chriſt was a true Prophet. Did it convince him? Does not THEODORET tell us, that the Miracle, tho he knew of it, made no Impreſſion on him? (iii. 20.) Did not God Almighty foreſee this? And can you imagine that he wou'd work a Miracle to anſwer an End which he was

ſure

ſure wou'd not be anſwer'd by it? Wou'd not this be working a Miracle in vain? The ſame Argument may be urg'd with equal ſtrength againſt the Miracle of ANTONINUS, and the Reaſons you have aſſign'd for it. I wonder to hear you ſay, that JULIAN's Miracle made no Converts to Chriſtianity, when SOZOMON aſſures us it made ſeveral, (v. 22.)

I DENY'D there were any *Aſiatick* Legions in the Army of ANTONINUS, but never ſaid there were no *Aſiaticks* in it. Nor does the Paſſage of CAPITOLINUS, to which you refer, prove it; unleſs you ſuppoſe *Diocritæ* to be the name of a People, or that the *Dardania* there mention'd lay in *Aſia*: which will be Diſcoveries the Geographers will thank you for.

THE Chriſtians, you ſay, might come into the Army at the ſame time; but for this you bring no other Argument than the Logick of Poſſibility, which will prove every thing true that does not imply a Contradiction. Our Armies were never ſo numerous as they now are, and to re-

cruit them we have been forc'd to have recourſe to Methods unknown under former Reigns: but we never heard that the Parliament thought of making a Law to preſs Quakers into the Service, whoſe Principles are againſt all Fighting.

I MIGHT go on to ſet you right in ſome Miſtakes you have made about my Opinion and Character of the Fathers; but ſince you have deny'd the Conſequences I thought you had drawn from it, I am in no great pain about the Premiſes.

I DON'T know what to ſay to the Judgment you have paſs'd on this whole Controverſy, becauſe I don't well underſtand you: For what Chaff can I have winnow'd, when I don't find that you have yielded one of the Articles in diſpute? And what Seed of Truth can remain, when I am fully perſuaded that you your ſelf don't think you have diſprov'd one of them?

FINIS.

INDEX

To Both Volumes.

The Letters ſhew the Volumes, the Figures the Pages of each.

A

ABDERITÆ, a pleaſant Story of that People, i. 205. Compar'd to the People of *England*. 206.

Accuſing, the Alteration of that Cuſtom tended to the Decay of the *Roman* Commonwealth. i. 138.

Alexander the Great, an Account of his coming to *Jeruſalem*, ii. 26, *&c.* Of his Dreams, and appearing before the High-Prieſt, 33. The Opinion of Writers concerning his March thither. 68.

America, of a Clap of Thunder which broke on an *Engliſh* Ship there. ii. 382.

Ancus Martius, left the *Roman* Affairs in the State he found them. i. 67.

Antiochus, King, a remarkable Medal of him, i. 264. Critical Remarks on it. 265, *&c.*

Annales Cyprianici, miſquoted by Mr. *Dodwell*. i. 359, 360.

Annales Leges, what they were. i. 93.

Antoninus did not aſcribe his Deliverance to a Miracle wrought by the Chriſtians, ii. 91. Thought himſelf oblig'd to his own Gods for it, 91, 92. Did not afterwards publiſh any Edict in favour of the Chriſtians, 93. His ill Character of them, a proof of it, 273. Perſecuted them after this Miracle, 95, 96, 264. Zealous for Heatheniſm, 121. His Letter to the Senate after the Victory, 233. In Extremity has recourſe to magical Sacrifices and Luſtrations, 235. He and the Senate aſcribe the Miracle to the Heathen Gods, 241, *&c.* His ſuppos'd Letter, giving the Honour of the Victory to the Chriſtians, not ſeen by any Writer, 245. His ſuppos'd Edict in favour of the Chriſtians not to be ſeen, 247. The Age of his Book ſettled, 270, *&c.* The Deliverance of his Army from the *Quadi*, tho true, no Miracle, 282, *&c.* Whether he was a Bigot or a Perſecutor, 305, 306. Whether his Victory over the *Quadi* was wonderful, 318. Some Writers ſay, that he acknowledg'd it was obtain'd by the Prayers of the Chriſtians, 319. His Reſcript, whether it be genuine, 335, *&c.* Had no *Aſiatick* Legions in his Army at the time of the Miracle, 348. His Daughter diſpoſſeſs'd of a Devil, 360. Accuſes the Chriſtians of Obſtinacy in their Sufferings. 375.

Appetites and Luſts, a Reſtraint ſhould be laid on them. i. 152.

Ariſtocracy, by what ſteps brought about in *Rome*, i. 65, *&c.* Was ſettled after the Expulſion of their Kings, 76. Founded on the ſhatter'd Ballance of the Monarchy, 78. Excludes

Excludes the Commons from all Places of Command, 78. Its Diſſolution occaſion'd by the private Factions and Intereſts of the Senate, 80. Influenc'd by other Cauſes, 81, *&c.* The more immediate Cauſes of its Diſſolution, 84. *viz.* The Reciſion of the Debts to the Commons, *ibid.* Erection of Tribunes, and other *Plebeian* Magiſtrates, *ibid.* The Power of propoſing and debating Laws, 85. The Commons uſurping a Right to try the Nobility for Crimes, *ibid.* An Equality of Suffrages in election of their Magiſtrates, 86. The obtaining a ſtanding Body of Laws, *ibid.* The excluding the Diviners from interpoſing in Debates or Reſolutions, 87. The *Agrarian* Law, which kept up the Ballance againſt the Incroachments of the Nobility, 88. The mighty Growth and Increaſe of the People, *ibid.* Repealing of Laws forbidding Marriages between the *Patricians* and *Plebeians*, 89. The Commons having liberty to be elected Conſuls, Dictators and Prieſts. 90.

Atinian Law, what it was. i. 144.

Augurs inſtituted by *Numa*, i. 51. Conſulted about all publick Reſolutions, *ibid.* Their Creation advantageous to the State. 54.

Aureus, of its Signification on Statues. i. 212.

Aurora Borealis, concerning ſuch Appearances in the Air. i. 373.

B

Balſam Tree in *Judea*, a valuable Plant. ii. 66.

Bath, the *Roman* Inſcription found there fully explain'd. i. 169, 174.

Barnabas, the Epiſtle under his name a Forgery. i. 388.

Baronius, his Opinion of the Time the Chriſtians had Churches examin'd, i. 382, *&c.* His Argument from a Paſſage in the *Philopatris* conſider'd, 383. And that from *Lampridius* alſo conſider'd. 386, *&c.*

Bird call'd a *Petrel*, an Account of it. i. 398, *&c.*

Bull, Dr. his Opinion concerning the *Philopatris*, i. 288. Examin'd. 289——292.

St. *Burien*, of the Inſcription there, i. 244. A Draught of it. 246.

C

Camillus, the Reaſon of his Conduct, i. 45, 46.

Cenſors, the Inſpection of Diſcipline and Manners committed to them, i. 134. This Office a noble Inſtitution, 145. To what things their Juriſdiction extended, *ibid.* A Defect in the Frame of this Office. 146.

Chriſtians, primitive, had no Churches till after the middle of the third Century, i. 376, *&c.* Objections againſt this Opinion anſwer'd, 381. Arguments for it, from the Poverty and Simplicity of the Times, 389. From *Minutius* and *Origen*, ibid. Probably built Churches in their long Peace, from *Valerian* to *Dioclefian*, 392. Flouriſh'd chiefly in the Cities, ii. 83. Abhorr'd Murder and Bloodſhed, 84. Reaſons why they could not ſerve in the *Roman* Armies, 86. Came into the Armies on the Relaxation of their antient Diſcipline, 87. The Perſecutions againſt them uſually begun in the Armies, 88. Whether they held War wholly unlawful,

ful, 111. Could not be Senators by reaſon of the Teſts, 148. Whether they believ'd the Miracle of the *Thundering Legion*, 275, *&c.* Have Arguments for their Religion that can never be anſwer'd by Deiſts, 291. Their number at *Rome* in *Nero*'s Reign, 322, 323. Burnt at *Smyrna* in *Antoninus*'s Reign, 362. Are Volunteers in their Martyrdom. 373.

Cincian Law, what it was. i. 91.

Clergy and *Nobility*, the Guard of the *Roman* Monarchy, i. 56. The only Ballance of a limited Conſtitution. *ibid.*

Clementine Conſtitutions a ſpurious Work. ii. 171.

Colonies, the beſt way of propagating an Empire, i. 109. And of ſecuring new Acquiſitions, *ibid.* Of excellent Uſe to the Commonwealth, 127, 128. Firſt inſtituted by *Romulus*, 128. Few made under the Ariſtocracy, *ibid.* Many under the popular Government, 128, 129. Of great Benefit to the *Romans*. 129.

Commodus puts a ſtop to the Perſecution rais'd by his Father. ii. 266.

Commonwealth of *Rome*, under it the *Romans* ſubdu'd the World, i. 117. When it was eſtabliſh'd, 119. Made great Conqueſts in *Italy* and in other Nations, 120. Their Counſels bold and courageous, 121. Advantages of this Government, 121, 122. The People increaſe prodigiouſly under it, 126, 127. Reaſons of its Corruption and Ruin, 132. Whence the ill execution of the Laws under it proceeded, 132, 133. Renovations in it, by whom effected, 134. A Reaſon of its ſteddy Support. 147.

Conant, Dr. his Letter to Dr. *Paynter* on an Inſcription in *Cornwall*. i. 244.
Conqueſts amazing, made by the *Romans*, i. 120. What promoted them, 121. Their more immediate Cauſes, 124, *&c.* How they were effectually ſecur'd. 131.
Conſtitutions, Apoſtolical, a Book of that name a Forgery. i. 398.
Cornelius, whether he continu'd a Soldier after his Chriſtianity. ii. 200, *&c.*
Corniſh Inſcriptions of Antiquity, an Account of them, i. 236, *&c.* A Draught of them. 243.
Cybele and *Iſis*, Prieſts of mendicant Orders. i. 41.

D

Debauchery, many Diſadvantages from it. i. 157.
Delphians offer Sacrifice to the Winds. ii. 367.
Delphick Miracle, an Account of it. ii. 383.
Democracy among the *Romans*, what way erected. i. 84.
Devon, Duke of, concerning his remarkable Medal. i. 281.
Dictators, contriv'd by the Nobility, i. 79. Had an unlimited Juriſdiction in all civil and criminal Caſes, *ibid.* The chief Deſigns of their Creation. 134.
Dio Caſſius, his Account of the Miracle which deliver'd *Antoninus*'s Army, ii. 312, 313. His Account examin'd. 377, *&c.*
Diviners, among the *Romans*, of all the Clergy had the greateſt Power and Authority. i. 39.
Dodwell, Mr. his Opinion in his Lectures of the *Philopatris* refuted, i. 297 to 302. Fixes its Date therein to *Severus*'s Reign, altho, in another Treatiſe, to that of *Antoninus*, 302.

302. His Lectures a mean Performance, *ibid.* A Rhapſody of crude Paradoxes and precarious Reaſonings, *ibid.* His *Acta Diurna* Forgeries, 303. His Letter concerning the Age of the *Philopatris*, 312 to 348. Conſiders a Paſſage in it concerning the *Scythians*, 315. Conſiders the Events related in it, 327, *&c.* Places its Date in the Reign of *Gallienus*, 330. His Letter concerning the *Philopatris* examin'd, and his Opinion rejected, 348 to 364. His Remark on the *Galileans* cenſur'd, 361. Alſo that on *Crato* the Uſurer. 362.

Dominion, Ballance of it changes with the Ballance of Property. i. 72, 73.

Drunkenneſs, the Evils of it. i. 155.

E

Eagles, *Roman*, whether of Gold or Silver. i. 213, *&c.*

Eaſt-India Trade, a Paſſage from Dr. *Prideaux*'s Connection concerning it examin'd. ii. 3.

Egypt, the Opinion of Geographers about its Situation. i. 311.

Elective Monarchies, for the Intereſt of the People, i. 57. Their Reigns often mild and happy, *ibid.* Their Intereſt not to invade the Liberties of the People. 61.

Eleutherius, when he was Pope. ii. 257.

Emilianus, when his Uſurpation in *Egypt* happen'd. i. 333.

England, the Regal Power antiently much limited, i. 105. The People under a Frenzy, 206. Their Frenzy compared to that of *Egypt*, 207. The Riſe of that Malady not to be accounted for, 206. Of the late Peace with

with *France*. 208.
Epaphroditus, in *Nero*'s Court, whether a Christian or Heathen. ii. 197.
Ephori at *Sparta*, the Design of their Institution. i. 104.
Epimenides, of his magical Lustrations. ii. 357.

F

Flaminian Law, what it was. i. 92.
Fowey, of the Inscription there, i. 176. A full Account of it, 178, *&c.* A Draught of it. 189.
French Trade, numerous Petitions against it. i. 209.
Fuller, Nicholas, his Opinion of the time the Christians built Churches, examin'd. i. 379.

G

Galilean, a name given to the Christians by the Heathens, i. 342. Remarks on that Name. 343, *&c.*
Gallienus no persecuting Emperor, i. 358. The Empire in his time under great Distractions, 358.
Garland, of the Christian Soldier who refus'd to wear it. ii. 205.
Gauls, Martyrs in *Antoninus*'s Reign. ii. 95.
Geta Britannicus, of that Monument, i. 223, 235. Was dug up a little way from the *Bath*, near *Julius Vitalis*'s Grave. 227.
Government, Roman, when Equality in it was introduc'd. i. 115.

H

Heathens, their calumnious Opinion of the Euchariſt, i. 396. Mention the Chriſtians without Reproach, ii. 252. Own the Chriſtian Miracles. 253.
Heraclas, of the time he dy'd, i. 308. Of his philoſophical Habit, 319. The numeral Letters of his Name. 326.
Hercules, why the *Romans* made Oblations to him. i. 47.
Hereditary Monarchs, often vicious, i. 57. Generally turn Tyrants and arbitrary Governors, 58. Have helps to encourage their Attempts to abſolute Dominion. 60.
Hoſtilius divided the Church and Crown-Lands among the People, i. 66. Inſtituted their Rights of hearing all Appeals. 67.

I

Janiculus, of the Sedition in that Mount, i. 116.
Joſephus, his Account of *Alexander*'s March to *Jeruſalem*, ii. 27. A Writer of good Senſe and Politeneſs, 35. Remarks on his Hiſtory. 35, *&c.*
Judgment Day, what Changes to be expected before it. i. 370.
Julius Vitalis, of a Treatiſe of that Name. i. 192.
Juſticia at *Arragon*, the Deſign of that Inſtitution. i. 104.

K

Kingly Government of the *Romans*, not free from Seditions, i. 102, 203. It provided no ſufficient Security for the Liberties of the People, 103, *&c.* Reaſons why it was incapable of making Couqueſts. 108.
Kings of *Rome*, moſt of their Wars defenſive. i. 110.

L

Laws, *Roman*, tending to eſtabliſh Democracy, i. 91, *&c.* The Moderation of them the worſt part of their Conſtitution. 141.
Leges Tabellariæ, an Account of them, i. 96, 97. Very advantageous to the Commons. 97, 98.
Legion, not an entire one of Chriſtians in *Antonimus*'s Army, ii. 82, *&c.* That mention'd by *Euſebius*, not call'd *the Thundering Legion* from a Miracle wrought in *Antoninus*'s Army, 90. One call'd ſo as early as *Auguſtus*, *ibid.* The Miracle of the Legion not aſcrib'd by *Antoninus* and the Pagans to the Chriſtians, 91. Is mention'd by *Apollinaris* and *Tertullian*, 97. Compar'd with other Miracles, 99. What Arguments are adduc'd to prove there was a Legion of Chriſtians in the Army, 105. That quarter'd at *Melitene* near *Cappadocia*, is the *Melitenian* mention'd by *Euſebius*, and the 12*ma Fulminatrix*, 343, *&c.* The Relation of *Euſebius* concerning the *Thundering Legion*, accounted for. 348.
Legions, *Eaſtern*, effeminate Soldiers. ii. 345.

Leſcard, the Author's Charge to the Grand-Jury there. i. 152.
Liberty and *Property* valuable Privileges. i. 162, *&c.*
Licinian Law what, it was. i. 91.
Lights in the *North*, what they portend, i. 368. Are only Meteors in the Air, *ibid.* Not prognoſtical of the general Conflagration. 369, *&c.*
Lobb, Mr. his Letter concerning the Monument at *Maddern*. i. 201.
Lucian not the Author of the *Philopatris*. i. 289, 298, 314.
Lucretia, her Rape occaſions a Diſſolution of the *Roman* Monarchy. i. 71.
Lyons, when the Perſecution was there. i. 255, *&c.*

M

Macchiavel, an Obſervation of his concerning Government. i. 148.
Maddern, of the Inſcription there, i. 191. Obſervations on its Orthography, 197. A Draught of it. 204.
Mawgan, of the Inſcription there, i. 248, *&c.* A Draught of it. 251.
Medals, of ſome in Mr. *Hayme's Teſoro Britannico*. i. 264—282.
Meteor, Letter concerning an uncommon one, i. 402. Another with a further Account of it. 406.
Miracle, what Writers mention that of the *Thundering Legion*, ii. 97, 98. Compar'd with other Miracles, 99, 100. Miracles wrought only when neceſſary, 101. Of that in *Julian* the Apoſtate's Reign. *ibid.*

Mirconde, his Hiſtory of *Perſia* a Rhapſody of Fables. ii. 16.

Monarchy, that of the *Romans* elective, i. 57. Advantages from that Conſtitution. 57, 58.

Muſgrave, Dr. a Letter to him concerning the Inſcription found at the *Bath*, i. 169. One to him concerning an Inſcription at *Frwey*, 176. Another on that Inſcription, 178. One concerning the Inſcription at *Maddern*, 190. One concerning his Treatiſe on *Julius Vitalis*, 192. One explaining the *Maddern* Inſcription, 196. One concerning the State of the Nation, *&c.* 205. A friendly Letter to him, 211. One concerning the *Roman* Eagles, 213. One concerning the *Corniſh* Inſcription, 236. Another, 248. A Letter about ſeveral Matters, 252. One with Remarks on his *Belgium Britannicum*, 255. One concerning Mr. *Hayme's Teſoro Britannico*, and ſome Medals mention'd in that Book. 264.

Muſters of the *Roman* Citizens to 667 *U. C.* i. 125, 126.

N

Nature, all its Works to be look'd on with Wonder and Admiration. i. 371.

Naylor's Letter of the time the Chriſtians built Churches. i. 376.

Numa courted to accept the *Roman* Crown, i. 11. Erects a Scheme of Religion, 12. The two Articles of it, 13. Inſtitutes a Ritual for Worſhip, 15. His great Principle of Morality, 17. His Policy in the Elections of Magiſtrates, 18. Tolerates all Religions, 19. Apply'd the Authority of the Church to defend the Grandeur of the Mo-

Monarchy, 51. Curbs the great Power of the People, *ibid.* Deſtroys their ſupreme Power of making Laws, 52. Uſes his own Prerogative as a wiſe Prince, *ibid.* Invades the Peoples Privilege in determining Peace or War, 53. Inſtituted Heralds at Arms, *ibid.* Divided the publick Lands of the City among the Citizens, 66. Separated the Prieſthood from the Kingly Power, *ibid.* Disbanded his Guards, and govern'd with great Moderation. 66, 106.

O

Oath, military, taken to the Heathen Emperors, what it was, ii. 177. Condemn'd by the Fathers, 182. Contrary to the ſecond Commandment, 185. Reckon'd unlawful by the Jews, 188. Not diſpenſed with to any. 191.

Octavianus's Poſterity did enjoy the Empire. ii. 76, 77.

Origen, of the Time he dy'd, i. 307. Of the Etymology of his Name, 319. Had no Changes of Raiment. 322.

P

Pagans embracing the Chriſtian Religion, call'd *Greeks*. ii. 230.

Paganiſm, original of that Name. ii. 83.

Pageantry, in Worſhip, not us'd in the primitive Times. ii. 367.

Perſecutions, encourag'd only by Tyrants and Prieſts, i. 25, 26. Some took their Riſe from popular Tumults. ii. 27.

Perſians, the Thunder that drove them from *Delphi*. ii. 283.

Perſomedes, the Original of that Word, ii. 38, 42. The meaning of it. 46.
Phænomena, Letter concerning ſome in the Air. i. 367.
Philip, a Perſecution rais'd by the People in his Reign, ii. 170.
Philopatris, a Diſſertation on that Treatiſe, i. 286. Its Deſign, 285. The Events mention'd in it, the only helps to know its Age, 286. When it was written, 286, *&c.* Different Opinions about its Age, 287, *&c.* Not written in *Antoninus*'s Reign, 289, 304. Probably written before the Council of *Nice*, 288. Not written by *Lucian*, 289, 298, *&c.* The Diſcourſe it ſelf is dull and profane, 292. The Events only applicable to *Diocleſian*'s Reign, 292. Written juſt after a Victory over the *Perſians*, 305. It ridicules the divine Oracles, 333. Deſign'd to raiſe a Perſecution againſt the Chriſtians. 345.
Polybius derives the Alterations of the *Roman* Government from moral Reaſons. i. 71.
Polycarp ſuffers in *Smyrna* in *Antoninus*'s Reign. i. 362.
Pontifex Maximus, his Power, i. 34. He only gave Advice in religious Matters. 35.
Popiſh Religion, a moſt bloody one, i. 161. An Account of ſome of their abſurd Tenets. 161, 162.
Prideaux, Dean, a Letter to him concerning a Paſſage in his *Connection* upon the *Eaſt-India* Trade, ii. 3. Another concerning his Account of *Zoroaſtres*, 6. A third concerning his Account of the *Perſian* Kings, 22. A fourth concerning *Alexander*'s coming to *Jeruſalem*, 36. His Letter to Mr. *Moyle*, 36.

He says *Zoroastres* was not King of *Bactria*, but a juggling Impostor, 37. A fifth Letter to him, 42. His second Letter to Mr. *Moyle*, 59. His third Letter to him of *Alexander*'s being at *Jerusalem*, 65. His fourth Letter to Mr. *Moyle*. 77.

Priests among the *Romans*, their Power in religious Matters, i. 20, 21. Were such as commonly had an Interest in the Civil State, 28. Their Constitution advantageous to the Government, 29. Dependent on the Civil Magistrate, *ibid.* What their Power was over the Consciences of Men, 31, *&c.* Subject to the Tribunes, 35. Their Revenues inconsiderable, 38. Were all Men of Quality and Riches, *ibid.* Not supported by the Oblations of the People, 40. Nor by Donations of Lands and Possessions, 42. Nor had they a Right to Tenths, 44, 45. Were not of the Commons because of Poverty, 49. Had settled Salaries after the Subversion of the Commonwealth. 50.

Proselytes embracing the Jewish Religion, called by the Heathens Jews. ii. 230.

Punick War, resolv'd on by the People of *Rome* against the Approbation of the Senate. i. 123.

Pythagoras, when he was at *Babylon*. ii. 11.

R

Rebellion at *Preston*, what was like to be the Event of it. i. 253.

Regulus takes a solemn Oath to return to *Carthage*, i. 32. Rejects the Offer of Absolution from the Priests. *ibid.*

Religion of the *Romans*, admirably adapted to the ends of Civil Society, i. 10. The Government of it wreſted by the Civil Power from the Prieſts. 23, 24.

Romans ſolemnly abjure the Regal Title and Office, i. 73. Held the Obligation of an Oath ſacred and binding, 74. Indemnify all that join'd with *Tarquin*, ibid. Reſtore the popular Laws of *Servius*, 75. Make ſuch ſteps as effectually exclude *Tarquin*, ibid. Make choice of an Ariſtocracy, 76. Reaſons of their ſubmitting to it, 77. Their Juſtice and Moderation induc'd foreign Nations to ſubmit to them, 124. What way they proceeded with the conquer'd Nations, 130. Their Subjects liv'd under the gentleſt Yoke in the World. 131.

Rome in its Infancy encompaſs'd with warlike Nations. i. 110.

Romulus Founder of the *Roman* State, i. 3. Settles Monarchical Government, 4. Erects noble fundamental Laws, *ibid.* Poſſeſſes the People with an Opinion of his divine Appointment, 5. Inſtitutes an Order of Nobility, out of whom he forms the Senate, 6. Introduces the Cuſtom of Patronage, 7. Eſtabliſhes a Guard, 8. Has a Legiſlative and Executive Power, 9. Several of his Steps neceſſarily made his Government limited, 61, *&c.* The Conſtitution of his State, the natural Seeds of the Commonwealth, 64. He dy'd without Iſſue, 65. Divides the publick Lands among the People, 66. Makes *Alba* a free State, *ibid.* Makes himſelf abſolute about the end of his Reign. 106.

INDEX

S

Sabbath, ſevere Penalties by the *Engliſh* Laws on the Breach of it. i. 154.
Sanderſon, Bp. his Opinion of military Oaths, ii. 183.
Seditions of *Rome*, the Kingly Government not free from them, i. 101, 202. Thoſe under the Commonwealth never came to Blood, 111. Perfected their Government, 112. Are moſt common in Ariſtocracies. *ibid.*
Senate, their Power in religious Matters. i. 21, 22.
Sergius Paulus, whether he could be a Chriſtian and Proconſul of *Cyprus*. ii. 196.
Servius Tullius advanc'd to the Throne by the favour of the Commons, i. 67. Gives the finiſhing ſtroke to the Ruin of the Monarchy, 67, 68. Apply'd himſelf entirely to the good of the People, 68. A Deſign form'd by the Nobility to dethrone him, *ibid.* Forms a Deſign of introducing an equal Commonwealth, *ibid.* Barbarouſly aſſaſſinated by the Nobility, 68. Eſtabliſh'd a military Diſcipline. 108.
Sherard, Dr. his Letter to Mr. *Moyle* of Birds and other Curioſities, i. 410. A Letter to him, 413. His ſecond Letter, 416. A Letter to him, 420. His third Letter, 425. A Letter to him. 428.
Soldier, in *Severus*'s Reign, puniſh'd for owning himſelf a Chriſtian. ii. 88.
Spain, a King of, cur'd of a Fit of Sickneſs by reading *Q. Curtius*. i. 256.
Swearing, the many Evils of it. i. 153.

INDEX.

T

Tale of a Tub, a moſt profane Piece of Ribaldry. i. 306.

Tarquinius Priſcus adds a hundred new Senators, i. 67. Adorns the Imperial Dignity with the Enſigns of Royalty, *ibid.* Submits his Title to the People. *ibid.*

Tarquinius Superbus uſurp'd the Throne in a lawleſs manner, i. 69. Invaded the Liberties of the Senate and People, 69. Account of his tyrannical Government and Expulſion. 107, 108.

Tertullian, his Notion of the numbers of the Chriſtians in his Time improbable, ii. 82, *&c.* He believ'd the Prophecies of the Montaniſts, 99. Turn'd Montaniſt, 281. When he wrote his Book *de Corona Militis*, ibid. Charges the Chriſtian Soldiers with the Idolatry of the Garland, 330. Said the military Oath was inconſiſtent with the baptiſmal Vow. 331.

Teſts, idolatrous, requir'd of the *Roman* Soldiers, ii. 176, *&c.* All Soldiers oblig'd to take theſe Teſts, 183. Were reckon'd unlawful by the Fathers. 182, *&c.*

Theatres, *Roman*, a Letter concerning them, i. 255.

Tranſplantation, of leſs Benefit to the *Romans* than Colonies. i. 129.

Tribunes of the People, the Prieſts ſubject to them, i. 35. Their Inſtitution ſacred and unalterable, 96. The Guard of Liberty committed to them, 134. The number of them was too great, 142, 143. Defects in their Powers and Qualifications. 144.

INDEX.

U

Valens Victrix, of the *Roman* Legion of that Name. i. 170, 171.
Veſtal Virgins had a publick Allowance from the State. i. 39.
Virtue, the many Advantages of it, i. 154, 155. 'Tis our Duty and Intereſt to be virtuous. *ibid.*
Vivian, Sir *Richard*, his Account of a *Corniſh* Inſcription. i. 249.
Uſurariæ Leges, what they were. i. 92.

W

Witſius, his Argument in relation to Perſecutions conſider'd. ii. 268, 269.

X

Xanthus, whether he was Author of the *Lydiaca*. ii. 73.
Xenophon, whether he was Author of the *Anabaſis*, ii. 60, 71, 72. Of his *Cyropædia*, 43, 44, 72. Offers Sacrifices to *Boreas*. 366.

Z

Zenobia acts againſt the *Roman* Empire. ii. 339.
Zoroaſtres, of the Age in which he liv'd, ii. 7, *&c.* The Alteration made by him, in the Religion of *Perſia*, examin'd, 17, *&c.* His Books ſtill extant in *Perſia* and *India*, 39. Which are regarded there as the *Alcoran* with the Mahometans, 40. Whether a *Perſian* or a *Mede*, 46, 47. Two of this Name mention'd by Hiſtorians. 59, 63.

THE END.